The Communist

20c. JUNE 1940

WORLD SOCIALISM AND THE WAR
WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

"DEMOCRATIC" DEMAGOGY
GIL GREEN

THE STALINIST CONCEPT OF NATION
HARRY MARTEL

THE NATIONAL NEGRO CONGRESS
THEODORE R. BASSETT

ROOSEVELT'S POLICY IN THE FAR EAST
B. T. LO

THE FARMERS AND THE WORKING CLASS
ANNA ROCHESTER

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

6,000 SOLD THE FIRST WEEK!

STALIN

The history of a whole epoch mirrored in the life of one man! Written by Stalin's closest co-workers, this new book constitutes a theoretical and practical history of the building of socialism in all its main phases. Each chapter illustrates the role and contributions of Joseph Stalin, as Lenin's successor, in developing and applying the principles of Marxism-Leninism to the solution of the historic problems facing the Soviet state which today flourishes on one-sixth of the earth's surface.

Among the contributors are V. M. Molotov, Klementi Voroshilov, L. Kaganovich, Georgi Dimitroff, Laurenti Beria, A. Andreyev, M. K. Kalinin and others.

192 pages. Cloth bound

Price 75 cents

●

A MARXIST BOOK-OF-THE-MONTH SELECTION

●

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

VOL. XIV, No. 6 JUNE, 1940

THE COMMUNIST

A MAGAZINE OF THE THEORY AND PRACTICE OF MARXISM-LENINISM
PUBLISHED MONTHLY BY THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF THE U.S.A.
EDITOR: EARL BROWDER

CONTENTS

Review of the Month	*A. B.*	483
World Socialism and the War	*William Z. Foster*	500
Lenin on the World Imperialist War	*V. I. Lenin*	516
Lenin Speaks of Debs	*Alexander Trachtenberg*	518
Imperialist War and "Democratic" Demagogy	*Gil Green*	521
The Stalinist Concept of "Nation"	*Harry Martel*	531
The Third National Negro Congress	*Theodore R. Bassett*	542
American Policy in the Far East and the Roosevelt Regime	*B. T. Lo*	554
The Farm Problem and the Working Class	*Anna Rochester*	565
Book Review *Freedom of Thought in the Old South*, by Clement Eaton	*Herbert Biel*	575

Entered as second class matter November 2, 1927, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Send checks, money orders and correspondence to THE COMMUNIST, *P. O. Box 148, Sta. D (50 E. 13th St.), New York. Subscription rates: $2.00 a year; $1.00 for six months; foreign and Canada $2.50 a year. Single copies 20 cents.*

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS ON IMPERIALISM AND WAR

●

The Jewish People and the War, by Earl Browder . . $.03

Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism, by V. I. Lenin .30

The War and the Second International, by V. I. Lenin . . .20

Is This a War for Freedom? by Ernst Fischer 10

The People Against the War-Makers, by Earl Browder . . .05

Social-Democracy and the War, by V. J. Jerome 05

The War and the Working Class of the Capitalist Countries, by Georgi Dimitroff 02

The War Crisis: Questions and Answers, by William Z. Foster .05

A Negro Looks at War, by John Henry Williams 03

The War and the Workers, by V. I. Lenin 10

I Didn't Raise My Boy to Be a Soldier—For Wall Street, by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn 01

No Gold Stars for Us—Our Boys Stay Home, by Ann Rivington .05

The Struggle Against the Imperialist War, by Georgi Dimitroff 02

Imperialism and the Imperialist War (1914-1917), by V. I. Lenin 2.00

Marxism and the National and Colonial Question, by Joseph Stalin 1.50

●

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

REVIEW OF THE MONTH

Imperialists Are Spreading the War. Wall Street Moves in the Far East and Western Hemisphere and the Government Intensifies War Preparations. What Does Washington Want with Mexico? People's Peace Forces Face Serious Tasks. Communist Election Message. What Is Required to Win the Fight for Peace? Dimitroff Outlines Program of Action. On the Dangers of Fatalism. A Platform of Struggle Headed by Browder and Ford. Greetings to National Convention. War Orientation of American Imperialism. Critics Within Imperialist Camp. War Preparedness a New Issue. Norman Thomas and the Socialist Party Platform. Pie in the Sky and No Struggle Today. A Program of "Socialization" Which Promotes Wall Street's War Preparations. Immediate Demands and Transitional Demands. Our Perspectives.

THE extension of the second imperialist war into Holland, Belgium and Luxemburg is bringing into sharper focus Wall Street's predatory imperialist aims, intensifying the Government's war preparations and accelerating the movement to mobilization day—"M-Day." It follows, therefore, that the anti-imperialist and anti-war movements of the masses of the people, especially the movements of labor, are facing now greater and more serious responsibilities.

As to the immediate aims of American imperialism, the extension of the war is forcing greater clarity. The masses are beginning to hear from leaders of the Government and from spokesmen of big business *new words*. Greenland. The Dutch East Indies. The West Indies. And these new words, repeated in imperialist circles with increasing frequency and stress, are intended not merely as lessons in geography. No. These words denote big and important colonial possessions, rich in raw materials and of great strategic value in the imperialist game of world domination, which American finance capital seeks to acquire and subordinate to its rule.

Not that the old words have been discarded. "Democracy," "civilization," "anti-fascism," "liberty," "religion"—all these relatively older words are still being used and will continue to be used by the warmongers to drag the American people into imperialist adventures and war. But these "slogans" are beginning to appear in the eyes of the masses ever more clearly as mere outer garments clothing something more real and substantial. As for example: democracy and religion may mean the Dutch East Indies; civilization and liberty may

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mean Greenland; and anti-fascism may quite easily stand for complete and unrestricted domination over the Western Hemisphere by Wall Street.

What has happened is that the extension of the war and the general sharpening of the imperialist struggle are forcing American imperialism to indicate more openly and plainly its immediate aims and objectives. And not only to indicate them *but to go after them.*

Thus, already in the middle of April, Secretary Hull served notice on the other imperialist powers, particularly on Japan, that the United States has an interest and a stake in the Dutch East Indies. Japan replied in kind. And at once, a fresh source of imperialist dispute has been opened which naturally constitutes a major element in the old struggle for the domination of the Pacific. New wars are threatened, with the United States a leading participant. And now that Holland is in the war, and its East Indian colonies have become the object of attack and seizure, Wall Street and the Washington Government are making haste. Senator Pittman declares (May 10) that "our Government has cause to watch developments in the Orient" and the American navy is ordered to remain in Hawaiian waters. Japan reasserts once more its interest in the "status quo" of the Dutch East Indies and, this time, Secretary Hull replies in kind. The imperialist conflict is evidently sharpening and is likely to enter an even sharper phase, with the acquisition of the Dutch East Indies standing out as a major immediate objective of American imperialism.

And let us remember: not "democracy" and "civilization" but colonies and strategic positions in the Pacific. It is for this that the Government is involving the country in imperialist adventures and is hastily preparing for war.

But the Far East is not the only place in which we are supposed to be "interested." There is also the Western Hemisphere and the Monroe Doctrine, not to forget Greenland. Here too greater dangers are brewing. And of these we must take stock.

As we do so, we are at once reminded of certain consultative provisions established by the Panama Conference of the American republics, held last October. These call for mutual consultations "in case any geographic region of America subject to the jurisdiction of any non-American state should be obligated to change its sovereignty." This at once raised the question of "what is to be done" with Greenland, a colonial possession of Denmark now occupied by Germany. And, in this connection, it will be recalled that President Roosevelt urged the American people "to study geography." Now, with Holland in the war as an ally of the Anglo-French bloc, the question is raised about the Dutch West Indies. These lie in the region of the Caribbean which Wall Street considers of major strategic importance to its imperialist plans and objectives.

But not only these. It is well known that the imperialists in the United States have never fully reconciled themselves to the idea

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of European powers having colonial possessions in the Western Hemisphere. On the contrary, Wall Street imperialism always dreamed of the day when these European powers will be completely dislodged from the Americas and replaced by our "own" bankers and monopolists. Now, with the European imperialist powers at war, American imperialism sees the opportunity of realizing this dream. Not all at once, perhaps, but by stages, depending upon developments. And the extension of the war to the Low Countries is accelerating the process.

Of course, this is not being done openly in the name of greater profits and power for Wall Street. No, that would be too crude. The American people couldn't be rallied for that. So the job is being planned with such deceitful watchwords as "national security," "continental solidarity," "the American way of life," etc., etc.

Furthermore: Knowing full well, as Wall Street imperialism undoubtedly does, that the extension and strengthening of American imperialist domination in Latin America is arousing great anxiety among the peoples of those countries and stimulates their resistance, the Washington Administration tries to cloak its expansionist moves with Pan-Americanism and Western Hemisphere "solidarity." President Roosevelt's speech to the American Scientific Congress (May 11) is unquestionably an imperialist move to enlist the support of the reactionary forces in Latin America for Wall Street's expansionist ambitions in this hemisphere. His appeal to the Americas that they "might have to become the guardian of Western culture, the protector of Christian civilization" is obviously designed to give a semblance of "collectivity" and a coloration of "ideology" to the predatory and *unilateral* plans of American imperialism to extend and strengthen Wall Street's power over the peoples of Latin America and to dislodge its imperialist rivals, utilizing their present difficulties.

The anxieties of the Latin American peoples over these developments are clearly apparent, and their resistance to American imperialism is growing. Just now, in view of the coming presidential elections in that country, Wall Street and the Washington Administration are paying particular attention to Mexico. American imperialism seeks to intervene actively in the Mexican presidential struggle with the nature of this intervention becoming clearer every day. It is to prevent the victory of the progressive and anti-imperialist forces of Mexico; and, should this prove impossible as it well may, to engineer an "uprising" against the Mexican government and to instal into power a president satisfactory to Wall Street. Almazan, for example.

All too suspiciously, the imperialist press of the United States has begun to talk of a "Mexican revolt." With brazen cynicism the *New York Post* declares, in a correspondence from Mexico City (May 9), that "presumably, the attitude of the United States Government would have considerable bearing on the Mexican presidential struggle, as it

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has had in so many previous Mexican contests. If the United States permits arms to reach only one faction, the victory of that faction usually is assured." Plain talk, isn't it? And if you wish to know which "faction" is favored by Wall Street, the *Post* tells you that also. It says that Almazan—

". . . commands the support of clerical as well as business elements, who resent the growing domination of Mexican life by the radical trade union hierarchy" and that "if Almazan comes to power [as against Camacho, the candidate of the anti-imperialist and progressive camp] he will find a way to settle the present costly struggle between the foreign oil companies and the Mexican government."

In other words, Almazan will sell Mexico and satisfy Wall Street. Hence, Wall Street and the Washington Government are orientating on a "Mexican revolt" which would give power to the betrayers of Mexico to function as a puppet of American imperialism. And this is how President Roosevelt seeks to "unite" the Americas to become "the guardian of Western culture and the protector of Christian civilization."

All this naturally calls for more rapid war preparations, "national unity" behind Wall Street, greater sacrifices by the masses of the people (workers, farmers, youth, unemployed, aged, Negroes), and sharper persecution of all those who oppose imperialist adventures and war. Thus, *The New York Times* reports from Washington (May 10) that "within a few hours after Germany's invasion of the Netherlands, Belgium and Luxemburg, movements started in the administrative and legislative branches of the Government for acceleration of the new defense program." More and more hundreds of millions for armaments and war preparations to put Wall Street's imperialist program into effect. Less and less money and attention to the burning needs of the unemployed, the farmers, the youth, the aged and the Negro people. More and more "M-Day" and G-man methods in the handling of the people's liberties and their mass organizations. Less and less of civil liberties for the masses and vanishing respect for the Bill of Rights by Government agencies. This is the trend of development which the masses must face, unite against and resist. The twenty-billion dollar wartime finance plan, outlined recently to army officials by Chairman Frank of the Securities and Exchange Commission, a plan which would literally rob the masses of the people of their daily bread to finance war preparations and war, plainly indicates the main direction of the Government's present policies.

Last but not least is the demand of the supporters of the Anglo-French bloc for "more help to the Allies." Says the *New York Post*: "We have given practical help. But we can safely give more." Reduce tariff barriers for British and French goods. Open up the field of private credits. Maneuver the country into extending large scale *government* credits to Anglo-French imperialism.

The imperialists and warmongers

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are intensifying their criminal efforts to transform the present war into a world slaughter. As the European war is spreading to new countries—

"The strife between the imperialists in the Pacific threatens to develop into new wars. A dispute has already begun between Japan, England and the United States over the Dutch East Indies. The bourgeoisie of the United States are, as a beginning, stretching out their hands to Iceland, Greenland and the possessions of Britain and France in the Caribbean Sea.

"The capitalist miscreants are dragging the peoples into a new world imperialist carnage." (The May Day Manifesto of the Communist International.)

And it is with a full understanding of this reality that the National Convention of the Communist Party is deliberating its policies and platform for the coming Presidential elections. It is concentrating the attention of the masses of the people on the aims and moves of American imperialism, on the war dangers resulting from them and on the best means of resisting and combating these dangers, on the best means of keeping America out of war. The motto is the united and daily struggle of the people, headed by the working class, against the imperialist and warmongering bourgeoisie, for keeping America out of war, resisting and combating the imperialist and war-making policies of the Washington Administration, exposing and defeating the Social-Democratic flunkeys of the imperialists.

Fraternal greetings to the National Communist Convention. Best wishes for the success of its efforts to help rally the toiling masses of America, and the working class in the first instance, around the slogans which are inspiring the struggles of the proletariat and its allies in all capitalist countries. For Peace, Bread and Freedom! Down With Imperialist War! Down With Capitalist Reaction! Peace to the Peoples! Long Live the Soviet Union, the Bulwark of Peace, Freedom and Socialism! Long Live the Fraternal Alliance of the Workers of All Lands!

* * *

IN RECENT weeks, certain imperialist circles in the United States have begun to spread a feeling of *fatalism* among the masses. The way it is done is this: "There is no way of keeping America out of war, no matter how much we try. We can hope, we can pray, we can strive. But eventually we shall be drawn in. So, what's the use of making an issue out of the question of keeping America out of war, and fighting about it? Events themselves will decide this question for us."

A neat little trick, this certainly is. And it has been lying in President Roosevelt's political bag for quite some time. It has been implicit in many of his pronouncements on foreign affairs since the beginning of the war in the recurring motive that we can only "hope" to keep out of the war but must be ready for the worst. Only he hasn't been stressing it so very much. Lately, however, this fatal-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

istic motive has tended to become more pronounced in the imperialist press of the country. Especially in the Republican press, but also in others.

Fatalism is a dangerous enemy to the anti-imperialist and anti-war camp. To the extent that the warmongers are able to instill into the masses a feeling of fatalism on the question of war, to that extent Wall Street will find it easier to drag the country into imperialist adventures and war.

Here is what Ludwell Denny reports to the *New York World-Telegram* on sentiments in the Middle West. Everybody, he says, talks about the question: "Will we be drawn into the war after the elections?" And the answer is:

"The people you talk with don't trust any of the candidates or statesmen very much on this issue. 'After the election we will be financing their war, and then it's only a matter of time—if the war lasts long enough we'll be in it, regardless.' This is the bitterly disillusioned comment one often hears." (May 4.)

He sums up the prevailing sentiments as "a strange mixture of resentment and fatalism."

What Ludwell Denny reports must be taken critically and discriminately. He spoke to Republican and Democratic politicians and mingled undoubtedly in bourgeois circles. Hence, his report cannot be taken as reflecting correctly the sentiments prevailing among workers and other toiling groups. We know from the growing activities of the peace movements among the masses that fatalism is *not* one of their characteristics. What then is the significance of Denny's report? It would seem to be twofold. First, it reflects a certain difficulty faced by the bourgeoisie in the midst of the second imperialist war and on the eve of a national election. It is afraid to let its two parties—the Republican and Democratic—make a major issue out of the question of keeping America out of war because this will tend to arouse the masses still further and will militate against the establishment of "national unity" behind the imperialist bourgeoisie. But it is equally afraid to suppress the issue altogether—as between the two major parties—because this may force the masses of the people to find some other political outlet and expression for their anti-war and anti-imperialist sentiments. Especially in the face of the growing *independent* peace movements of the masses and the increasing initiative and leadership of *progressive labor.*

This is a real difficulty, a serious contradiction which the bourgeoisie has thus far been unable to solve to its own satisfaction. The result has been to try to find a solution in some such attitude as that reported by Denny. Namely: it is not important what politicians may say before the elections on keeping America out of war. Whether they be Republican or Democratic, once they are elected they will do the right thing by the situation. Because, after all, "we" are all agreed on the main thing. "We" all want to keep America out of war "if it is possible." But should it prove impossible, as it well may, then which-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ever of the major parties is returned to power next November, it will have to do the right thing "to defend our national interests."

The *Herald Tribune,* Wall Street's Republican mouthpiece, states this attitude very plainly, even cynically. It says:

"One reason why the debate on the war is not very significant is that there is so little that is really significant to be debated. The war problem will not be answered by debate. It will be answered by the impact of events upon an attitude already clearly defined." (April 29.)

Having discovered that a fatalistic attitude on the war question may resolve the contradiction which the bourgeoisie is facing in the elections, the job of its spokesmen is to instill that attitude into the minds of the *masses;* make the *people* believe that there is no escape; convince *them* that the question of war or peace is not an issue, that there is no significance in debating it, and that the debate will decide nothing anyway. And this is the second part of the meaning of Denny's report. *It is the calculated intention of the imperialists to paralyze the peace movements of the masses by an attitude of fatalism* and, incidentally, to enable the Republican and Democratic Parties to carry through the election campaign as two "opposing" camps without creating serious divisions in the country.

One need not assume that the entire imperialist camp of this country is united on using fatalism as a weapon of paralyzing the mass peace movements and of solving the peculiar contradictions of the "two-party system" in the present election struggle. No. Such complete unity does not exist. The *New York Times,* another mouthpiece of Wall Street imperialism, demands of the two major parties debate and "frankness," criticizing the "evasions" and "ambiguities" of such Republican aspirants to the Presidency as Dewey. And Colonel Frank Knox, a pillar of Republicanism in the Middle West, takes a similar position. These circles are probably moved by the fear that fatalism is too passive a weapon with which to try successfully to chain the masses to the imperialist wagon, that it wouldn't inspire them to sacrifice, that the very cynicism of this attitude—"It doesn't matter what the politicians of the two major parties say or promise"—may tend to drive away from these parties large masses of people.

As a result, the imperialist camp is still far from united on the question of election tactics, even though we are only weeks removed from the national conventions of the two capitalist parties. To overlook and to fail to exploit this absence of complete unity would be an error. Yet the more important thing, the one that really matters *fundamentally,* is a realization that the *entire* imperialist camp and the dominating forces of *both* capitalist parties, Republican and Democratic, have one and the same aim in the election campaign. It is to prevent by all means the firm crystallization of confidence among the masses of the people in their ability to resist successfully the imperialist and war course of the bourgeoisie

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and its government. It is to instill by whatever means (and on the question of means there are still differences) a feeling among the masses that, whatever they do, they cannot appreciably change the "predestined" course of events.

It is this fatalistic attitude which the anti-war camp must expose and challenge most sharply. On this there can hardly be any doubt. The question is: how?

We shall be helped greatly in solving this question by certain observations of Comrade Georgi Dimitroff made as recently as on May Day. Reviewing the peace movements in various capitalist countries and their tasks, he said:

"It may be said without exaggeration that there is no country in the world where the yearning of the masses for peace has not been manifested in one form or another. This movement is still in its early stages, but it will inevitably spread and grow as the war proceeds." (*The Struggle Against the Imperialist War*, p. 13, Workers Library Publishers, New York.)

The orientation is on a spreading and growing peace movement of the masses in all countries. This is a realistic orientation, not just wishful thinking, and no one will deny that. But will the peace movement be able to accomplish anything? Will it develop capacities to influence the course of events? Is there a prospect that the masses in the United States may actually succeed in *frustrating* the imperialist and war-making course of the American bourgeoisie?

Again, speaking from the standpoint of all countries, Comrade Dimitroff answers to this question: Yes. But not just simply "yes." He proceeds to demonstrate *how* it can be done and what *measures of struggle* must be adopted in order to achieve this result. He says:

"But if the movement for peace is to exert a decisive influence on the course of events it must be united and led by the working class." (*Ibid.*)

Note the fact that he doesn't question the possibility of the peace movements exerting "a decisive influence on the course of events." His entire analysis proves this to be a realistic and practical possibility. But he concentrates very much on guarding and warning against the assumption that peace can be had merely by wishing for it. On the contrary. Speaking about the imperialists of the belligerent countries, he says plainly:

"It would be naive to think that after they have dragged more than one thousand million people into war, after they have already mobilized twenty million men and staked everything in their struggle for world hegemony, the imperialists will stop half-way. On the contrary, they will do their utmost to secure decision of their imperialist dispute on the field of battle, criminally shedding the blood of their own people and of other peoples under their power. *The imperialists will not voluntarily consent to the cessation of war, they will not renounce their plan of extending it and converting it into a world carnage as long as the international working class and the peoples of their countries do not put an end to*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their monstrous villainy." (*Ibid.*, p. 9. Our emphasis—A. B.)

From this it is clear that it would be equally naive to think that the imperialists of the United States will voluntarily give up their imperialist adventures and war-making plans. On the contrary, they will do, are doing, all in their power to go through with it to the end. Only a united people's peace movement, led by the working class, fighting militantly in collaboration with the world peace movement, can resist successfully and eventually frustrate the realization of the imperialist and war-making adventures of the American bourgeoisie. Such a peace movement can do it, and this has to be built and developed, a peace movement that will exert "a decisive influence on the course of events." But we must realize that one of the greatest enemies on this path is *the feeling of fatalism* spread by the imperialist bourgeoisie and its Social-Democratic flunkeys.

It is of absolute importance that American labor, as part of the international proletariat, should acquire a clear realization of the major task confronting it. Stating it for the working class of the world, Comrade Dimitroff formulates the task as follows:

"A task of the greatest magnitude and of the utmost gravity falls to the lot of the international proletariat. *It is to prevent the spread of war to other countries, to resist its conversion into world slaughter and, in defiance of the criminal designs of the bourgeoisie, to deliver the peoples from the abyss of imperialist war.*" (*Ibid.*, p. 10.)

The successful struggle for the realization of this task demands of the international proletariat and, as part of it, of the American proletariat, the following:

"First, union of the fighting forces of the working class within each country;

"Second, a genuine popular front of working people, led by the working class;

"Third, united action of the proletariat internationally, and its own independent, single international policy in struggle against imperialist war;

"Fourth, combination of the struggle of the working people in the capitalist countries with the anti-imperialist movement in the colonial and dependent countries;

"Fifth, rallying the working people around the great Land of Socialism, the only state which champions the cause of peace among nations and which defends the vital interests of the working people of the whole world.

"Such a united front of the working class, such a broad front of the working people can be created only by relentless struggle against the most perfidious enemies of the working class and of socialism—the Social-Democratic leaders." (*Ibid.*, p. 15.)

This is a *practical* and *realistic* program of struggle for peace. It is based upon the realization that, since the first world imperialist war (1914-17), a most profound change has taken place in the relation of forces in the world, a change resulting from the general crisis of capitalism and its continuous deepening and sharpening, from the victory of socialism in the mighty Soviet Union and its growing in-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fluence in world affairs, from the experiences of the masses with the first imperialist war, from the existence of a world Communist movement and fighting influential parties in all countries. This change is immensely favorable to the forces of anti-imperialism and peace. It is this change in the relation of forces which makes the program of action formulated by Dimitroff practical and realistic, and this should create impregnable confidence among the masses in their ability to fight *successfully* for peace.

This is the kind of program that emerges from the National Convention of the Communist Party (May 30-June 2). It is embodied in its platform, for which our standard bearers in the election will seek to rally the masses of the American people. It is a program of action resting on the proposition that:

"Today in the question of peace the socialist Soviet Union . . . casts its weight into the scales. The imperialist powers can no longer settle things as if they were just 'among themselves,' for the cause of the working people of the whole world is now linked up with the great land of socialism. *This mighty shift in the relation of forces in favor of the workers and all toiling people makes real the prospects of success in the struggle for peace.*" (Peter Wieden, "The Struggle for Peace," *The Communist International*, No. 3, p. 165.)

* * *

THE American supporters of the Anglo-French imperialist bloc are getting to be impatient. They pretend to be (or maybe they are) awfully frightened of the Allies' reverses in the war and they demand more action, more support for England and France. And they are firing away at those "politicians" and "statesmen" who don't seem to share these fears but, on the contrary, are inclined to let the belligerents fight it out to mutual exhaustion, proceeding on the theory that when the belligerents are exhausted, then the time will be ripe for American imperialism to step in and make the best of the situation.

Walter Lippmann, who behaves occasionally as though he were the anointed leader of American imperialism instead of one of its hired scribes, is totally dissatisfied with those in the imperialist camp who prefer to gamble on the exhaustion of the belligerents. "We are also told," he writes sarcastically, "that the security of the United States cannot be impaired, no matter who wins the war in Europe, because the victors will be too exhausted to go on." (*Herald Tribune*, May 2.) And we are being told all of this, not just by anybody, according to Lippmann, but by very important people. He says:

"Indeed there are many statesmen and politicians who are basing their whole conception of the war upon it." (*Ibid.*)

Clearly, Lippmann does not like this conception. To him, the chief justification for the existence of the United States is to save the British Empire. But to present it like this to the American people would be too crude. So, the saving of the British Empire becomes "a national interest" of the United States. And this is what Lippmann is arguing,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

addressing himself to the leaders of the American bourgeoisie.

He is quite evidently disturbed. He seems to be disturbed, no less than Churchill and Chamberlain, at the fact that:

"The view is widely held that at the end of the war in Europe all the fighting nations will be completely exhausted; the vanquished will collapse in a revolutionary upheaval, and the nominal victors will be too weakened to move."

Of course, this is not the complete view. The conclusion is missing. And the conclusion made by "many statesmen and politicians" is that the American bourgeoisie, basing itself upon and preparing for such an outcome as favorable to its imperialist aims, should step in at the last moment to secure for itself the major share of the spoils.

This orientation of the American bourgeoisie, which Lippmann emphatically disapproves, is thoroughly analyzed by Comrade Dimitroff in his May Day statement. It reads:

"America is feverishly preparing for war. The bourgeoisie of the United States is banking on the eventual exhaustion of the warring countries in order to step in at the last minute and dictate its terms and seize the lion's share of the spoils in the redivision of the world. Meanwhile it is taking advantage of the distraction caused by the war to weave its toils around Mexico and to penetrate deeper into Latin America, driving out its competitors." (*Cited place*, pp. 4-5.)

The very policy of the American bourgeoisie and its Government, which seeks the spreading of the war, which has already transformed the United States into an arsenal for the Anglo-French bloc, which is now maneuvering to make the United States the banker of this bloc—this very policy is calculated to draw the warring countries *deeper into the mire of slaughter* and to make *sure* of their eventual exhaustion.

And the war preparations, the preparations for stepping in at the last minute, are becoming *more feverish*. The President has already recommended to Congress the appropriation of over a billion dollars for armaments (May 16). "National defense," meaning preparations for war, is becoming the big and overwhelming issue between the Republican and Democratic Parties. In search for campaign issues against Roosevelt and the Democrats, Dewey and the other Republican aspirants have at once seized upon the extension of the war to make "unpreparedness" a major issue against the Administration. The charge is that, while talking big, Roosevelt has not prepared the country militarily for the eventual exhaustion of the belligerents when the United States will have to step in. It looks now that this may become the major issue (this and the New Deal) between the two capitalist parties.

In fact, the newer line of attack upon the Administration developed by some of its Republican opponents (also by General Johnson) is very much similar to the one used by Lloyd George against Chamberlain. Namely: he didn't preserve the peace and failed to prepare for war.

The upshot of all this is most certain to be a race between the two

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

capitalist parties in championing greater armaments and preparedness for war. Preparedness for war in all fields: military, economic and political. And this means a faster rate of destruction of the social services and of the civil rights of the people. It means greater exploitation of the masses and sharper attacks upon their progressive organizations, especially the trade unions. It means all of this, unless greater unity and more effective resistance are developed by the anti-imperialist and anti-war camp, unless the class unity of labor makes more rapid advances, displaying greater and more active initiative in the crystallization of the people's peace front, and moving faster to organize the unorganized.

To help labor achieve these aims more rapidly is the major immediate purpose of the Communist election campaign and of its standard bearers, Browder and Ford.

* * *

NORMAN THOMAS does not believe that the fight against the war and for keeping America out of it is a major issue in the election campaign. To him, it is rather a minor and subordinate affair. And here are his own words:

"The keynote of the campaign—or perhaps I should say the major issue of the campaign—is not keeping America out of war. It is winning the war against poverty in America without losing, but rather by increasing, our democracy. That requires that we keep America out of war and it requires many other things besides." (*The Call*, April 27.)

To one unfamiliar with the treacherous nature of Social-Democratism, with its peculiar tricks of making the name of socialism serve capitalist reaction in its worst forms, it will be difficult to understand what Norman Thomas is driving at. But it will sound phony just the same. For how is it possible to say that the struggle against poverty, which means the struggle against capitalist exploitation and capitalism, *requires* that the struggle against war, the most brutal and terrible expression of capitalism, should be relegated to secondary place and made a subordinate issue? The common sense of the worker will tell him that it is *impossible.* It is telling him so already. Then, what is Norman Thomas' idea?

Well, there *is* an idea. It is the old and damnable reformist trick of dazzling the eyes of the masses with deceitful promises of the future so as to take their attention away from the present. It is the trick of promising you "socialism" tomorrow, by merely casting your vote for Norman Thomas on election day, so you won't have to fight to stop a wage cut today, or to secure a wage increase, or to protect your union, or to defend your civil rights, or to engage in the difficult and serious job of fighting for peace and for keeping America out of war.

It is as though Norman Thomas would be saying to the masses something like this: "Why should you bother your heads too much with war, capitalist reaction and such-like unpleasant business? Why should you enter into bitter struggles, which entail very often sacri-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fice on your part and suffering, when all you have to do is to vote for me, Norman Thomas, on election day and all this terrible reality of today will disappear like a bad dream?" A magician, you will say? Yes, and a faker.

The progressive labor movement should be able to see through this trick. And it is our *main job* to help them. We can point to the experiences which this labor movement is going through at this very moment. It is unfolding a campaign of resistance against the capitalist offensive *on all fronts*. True, the unfolding is slow, but the process itself is unmistakable. And how is labor doing it? Is it saying that the war and the war danger are minor and subordinate propositions? Is it saying that the fight against poverty is the major thing and that the struggle to keep America out of war should be placed in second, third or fourth place, lumped together with many other smaller things? No. Labor does not say that at all. In all its resolutions and demonstrations since the outbreak of the war, it puts the struggle against imperialism and for keeping America out of war in one of the most prominent places. It makes the fight against war *a major issue inseparably connected with the struggle for jobs, relief, security, civil rights, etc.*

Look at the slogans to which ever larger numbers of workers, youth, Negroes, toiling farmers and other working people are rallying today. What are they? *Peace, security and civil rights. Keep America out of war. The Yanks are not coming. Work not war. A job here, not death over there. Stop the war. Defend the Bill of Rights. Organize the unorganized. Protect and improve your wage standards.* And many others, chief among them the support for the peace policies of the Soviet Union.

These few slogans—mass slogans—were taken at random, but they are sufficient to demonstrate that progressive labor and its allies, with varying degrees of political consciousness, are developing *a major fight* against the imperialist war, for keeping America out of it, for peace, and are doing it *in closest connection,* inseparable connection with the struggles against poverty, insecurity, reaction. How else can it be? All of these issues are inseparable. They arise from the offensive of the imperialist bourgeoisie, which strikes on all fronts: imperialist adventures, war preparations, increased exploitation, attacks on the unions, on the Communist Party, general curtailment of civil liberties, destruction of the social security services, etc., etc.

More than that. This offensive of the bourgeoisie in America is itself a result of the deepening general crisis of the capitalist system, and of the economic crisis, which produced the second imperialist war and which is conditioning very largely Wall Street's reactionary and war-making policies. The war, and the war danger for America, stand, therefore, *in the very center* of things. Life itself made it so, or rather the general crisis of the capitalist system at this juncture. The masses feel it instinctively and that's why there are moving into this fight, seeing in war one of the greatest dangers confronting them.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A danger which brings with it all the other dangers.

But not so for Norman Thomas. For him the major issue is *not* keeping America out of war. The American imperialists and warmongers can desire nothing better of Norman Thomas. If he can succeed in taking the minds of large masses off the issue of imperialism and war; if he can convince them to relegate to the background the fight for keeping America out of war; if he can do this and nothing more—and this is his plan—he will have rendered American imperialism a valuable service indeed.

* * *

BUT he plans to do for the American bourgeoisie much more than that. And along similar lines.

Take the election platform of the Socialist Party, the party whose candidate for the presidency is Norman Thomas. According to this platform, "democratic socialism becomes an immediate demand." (*The Call*, April 20.) To those unfamiliar with reformist tricks, this may look very radical, almost revolutionary, and certainly more "Left" than the Communist platform. For what can be more "revolutionary" than "*immediate*" socialism? And this is what Norman Thomas and the Socialist Party are promising the people in their election platform, if only the masses will cast their votes for Thomas.

But these are only tricks. Old reformist tricks. For when you examine the platform closer, Norman Thomas' "democratic socialism" shrinks a bit and becomes "immediate socialization." And by the time you are through reading it, the whole business comes down to plain and ordinary public ownership of certain key and basic industries as well as banking, to be given into the hands of *a capitalist and imperialist government.*

This latter point, Norman Thomas will deny. He will say that his platform of public ownership presupposes the election of himself as the next President of the United States and of the next government being in the hands of the Socialist Party; and that in *their* hands, what looks like plain public ownership will become real "democratic socialism." Should Thomas make this kind of a defense of his platform, he will most certainly be asked a couple of plain questions. For example: What do you think your chances are of being elected? And what do you believe are the chances of the Socialist Party capturing a majority of both houses of Congress?

Many more simple, almost technical questions will be asked of Norman Thomas. For example: Do you know that the Senate cannot be captured this year because not enough of its members come up for re-election? And most important of all, from the parliamentary point of view, *has your party placed on the ballot a sufficient number of candidates for Congress to constitute a majority, if elected*? We submit that this one is a very minor and technical question, hardly worth discussing from the point of view of revolutionary socialism. But when we are promised "democratic socialism" by voting for Thomas in November, 1940, "imme-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

diate" socialism, which means sometime in the beginning of 1941, we have a right to ask whether Thomas and his party have at least placed on the Congressional ballots a sufficient number of people to constitute a majority in Congress in support of their President.

But as soon as this question is asked, it is at once discovered that very few candidates of the Socialist Party will be on the Congressional ballots; that even if all of them should be elected (which is very doubtful), they would constitute an infinitesimal minority in Congress. Then, assuming that Thomas is elected President, for which one has to have a fantastic imagination, how is he going to give the people "immediate" socialism?

From which alone it follows that Norman Thomas and his party *themselves* do not take seriously their promises of "immediate" socialism; that they are bluffing and faking. They are talking of socialism as "an *immediate* demand" merely to draw the masses away from the immediate and daily struggle against the capitalist offensive, from the struggle which the capitalists fear, from the struggle which protects the masses at once from the onslaughts of their class enemies and prepares the working class for the socialist revolution and socialism. Consequently, Norman Thomas' immediate and democratic socialism turns out to be nothing else but a calculated design to weaken the struggle of the masses against the present war-making offensive of the capitalist class and to retard the advance of the masses to the revolutionary struggle for power and socialism. It is the same as with Thomas' other proposition that keeping America out of war "is not a major issue in the campaign."

But something else follows as well. Norman Thomas' campaign for public ownership of key branches of economy, as the major issue, helps the capitalist class to prosecute its reactionary and war-making offensive *also in another way*. It coincides with all those tendencies in the capitalist class which move towards a more embracing *war economy*, which seek greater *concentration* of economic and political power in the hands of the monopolies and their government, which aim at a closer *integration* of finance capital with the machinery of government. These are real and powerful tendencies —economic and political—within the bourgeoisie, stimulated by its imperialist and war-making course, seeking more effective weapons for hamstringing the people at home and for war abroad. These imperialist tendencies may or may not take the form of "public" ownership or "nationalization" of certain branches of economy, but they will certainly take very *similar* forms. As a matter of fact, the "M-Day" plan of the War Department already contains several provisions for the Government taking over for war purposes large sections of the nation's economy, taking them over together with the monopolies, for "joint" management, but in reality *extending* the power of the monopolies over the economic and political life of the country.

Therefore, to advocate at this

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

time *immediate* public ownership of certain key branches of economy, with finance capital remaining as it is in complete domination of the economic and political life of the country, with the bourgeoisie preparing feverishly for war, *is to help directly* the war preparations and imperialist course of the American bourgeoisie. It is pouring water over the mills of the war-makers. And this is what Norman Thomas and the Socialist Party platform are doing.

The demand for the nationalization of certain key branches of the economy of the country can become a powerful weapon in the hands of the working class, *under certain conditions,* in the struggle against the monopolies and in *transition* to the socialist revolution. But only under certain conditions. It will be recalled that the Communist Party favored and advocated the inclusion of nationalization demands (for the railroads, banks and munitions industries) into the platform of the democratic and people's front as a program *to be realized by a peoples' front government.* And the coming of a people's front government into power, should events make possible and desirable such a development, was conceived by the Communist Party as taking place in the surrounding of a severe political crisis, with the bourgeoisie hopelessly divided and seriously paralyzed, with the working class, influenced by a strong Communist Party, *heading* a united and powerful people's front, able to back up effectively the program of its Government.

Under such conditions, nationalization of key branches of economy will prove a most powerful means of meeting *immediately* and radically some of the most burning and elementary needs of the masses. For instance, to provide at once enough food, clothing and shelter for everybody. Under such conditions, nationalization by a people's front government would lead to a serious *undermining* of the economic and political power of the monopolies and of finance capital. And under these same conditions, nationalization is conceived of and carried through *as a transition* to working class rule and the socialist reorganization of society.

That's why the Communist Party does not discard the nationalization demands. It points out that in the immediate situation there is no room for them; they would be harmful. But in the perspective with the growth of the people's front movement under working class leadership, which is possible only in the course of daily struggle *for the immediate and partial demands of the masses,* a people's front government may come into power, on the basis of the further sharpening of the capitalist crisis and the growth of the people's peace front. The program of *such* a government will include nationalization demands. Hence, nationalization demands at this time cannot be immediate or partial demands, because the victory of a people's front government is not an immediate possibility. Therefore nationalization demands today can only be projected *as a perspective* of the victory of a people's government and as *transitional* demands

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

transitional to the socialist revolution.

That's why the Communist Party brands the platform of the Socialist Party's "immediate" socialization, not only as a snare and a fake, but also as calculated to promote the war-making and reactionary drive of the American bourgeoisie.

All of which demonstrates afresh the absolute correctness of the following conclusion which Comrade Dimitroff urges the international working class to make from the present situation:

"An essential condition for success in the struggle of the working people against imperialist war and capitalist reaction is to open the eyes of the masses to the treacherous role of Social-Democracy, to arouse the anger and indignation of the masses against it, to wage relentless struggle against Social-Democratism. Hence the elimination of Social-Democratism from the ranks of the working class movement is the duty not only of the Communist vanguard but of all honest members of the working class movement and of the entire working class." *(Cited place,* p. 19.)

A. B.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD SOCIALISM AND THE WAR

BY WILLIAM Z. FOSTER

The Status of Capitalism and the Revolutionary Forces

WHEN the capitalist rulers of the world, in first line the British imperialists, in their insatiable greed for profit and power, set out to butcher millions of people, to enslave the masses, to destroy incalculable wealth, and generally to disorganize society, as they are doing in this imperialist war, they pose the question of socialism before the masses in the sharpest form and put into jeopardy the very existence of their capitalist system. The workers, farmers and other toilers deeply hate war. When the imperialists in their brutal wars confront them with a perspective of slaughter, slavery and pauperization, it constitutes a ruthless challenge to these masses to stop the war as best they can and to find the path out of their intolerable situation by abolishing the monstrously obsolete capitalist system and instituting socialism.

The workers and other toilers in all countries are fighting for peace, to prevent the spread of the war and to defend their living standards, organizations and civil rights. This struggle leads inevitably to the accomplishment of the central task of the workers, that of ending capitalism, of abolishing the monstrous system that gives birth to this brutal slaughter and countless other outrages. The workers' answer to the imperialist war is not support of either Allied or German imperialism, but a fight for socialism.

A first consideration, if the toiling masses are to fulfil their socialist mission in this crucial period, is carefully to evaluate their forces and those of their capitalist enemies. Such an evaluation is doubly needful because of the current attempts of many renegades from Communism, Social-Democrats, and "Left liberals" to minimize or discount altogether the strength of the world anti-capitalist forces. In an ever-increasing flood of books, articles and speeches, Corey, Thomas, Eastman, Lovestone, Cannon and many others of a similar stripe are not only denying the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union, but are asserting that the revolutionary movement has been defeated all over the world. Many of them are also attacking Marxism-Leninism in principle, declaring that the class struggle is non-existent and that the proletarian revolution is only

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

illusion. To protect the masses om these poisonous defeatists a oroughgoing evaluation of the resent status of world capitalism id the struggle of the revolution- y forces is a prime requisite.

The Degeneration of World Capitalism

A practical way to approach such evaluation is by comparing the esent international economic and litical situation with that ob- ining at the outset of the World ar in 1914. Since 1914 a profound ange has taken place in the rela- ve strength of the class forces, of e imperialist and anti-imperialist rces.

The fundamental basis for this ange is the fact that during the terim of twenty-five years the neral crisis of the world capital- t system has been vastly deepened id intensified. Capitalism has not covered from the devastating eco- mic and political shocks it ceived from the World War, pecially its loss of one-sixth of e world to socialism. Moreover, roughout the succeeding years it s been subjected to the disin- grating effects of the ever-sharp- ing contradiction between the in- easing producing power of the orkers and farmers and the re- ricted capacity of the international pitalist market. This basic and curable contradiction, inherent in e private ownership of the in- ustries and the land, together with e planless method of capitalist oduction, has been greatly ag- avated by the increasing domi- nce of monopoly capital during the riod since 1914. In its final monopoly stage the whole capitalist system has sunk deeper and deeper into decline and decay.

Consequently, the first major difference to note between the two imperialist wars is that capitalism, as the present war begins, is far weaker than it was at the beginning of the World War in every aspect: economic, political, and social.

Economically, this capitalist weakness is clearly illustrated on a world scale by the facts that industrial production in early 1939 lagged far behind 1929 levels and that agriculture had sunk into a chronic crisis. World commerce was also far below previous figures. The gold standard had been shattered, both in the internal economies of the various countries and in their international dealings; and more than two-thirds of the world's gold supply had become monopolized by the United States. More and more the barter system had come into operation between nations, and various countries were resorting to the undermining principles of autarchy. They had also repudiated their international debts and degraded their treaties into mere scraps of paper.

The economies of the leading capitalist countries on the eve of this war were in a sickly condition. All of them, the rich United States included, have had to grant government subventions to industry and agriculture during the past decade, in the form of work relief projects, housing programs, huge armaments, and the like, in order to prevent complete economic collapse. National debts were piled up sky high

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and tax rates also had soared. Nevertheless, this pulmotor treatment, or shot-in-the-arm economics, had failed completely to revive capitalism, both in the fascist countries and in the "democracies." Everywhere the masses suffered catastrophic declines in their living standards. This economic stagnation we can see typically in the United States, where even the New Deal spending of twenty-five billions of government money could not rehabilitate the national economy. Industry still languishes, agriculture remains in crisis, twelve million idle workers walk the streets, and the government has now embarked upon the deadly expedient of building up the country's economy on the basis of war orders and a vast armaments program.

The economic decay of capitalism had spread like a cancer, in the period before the present war began, to the colonial and semi-colonial countries. These lands, chiefly producers of agricultural products and raw materials for the great capitalist countries, were all more or less chronically prostrated economically. Also, their prospects of one day evolving into industrialized capitalist countries, already rendered remote by the repressive colonial policies of the imperialists, had become doubly impossible by the advancing general decay of world capitalist economy.

The decline of the capitalist economy under the growing rule of finance capital inevitably led to the degeneration of the capitalist political system. Hence, the widespread decay of bourgeois democracy everywhere and the growth in many countries of fascism, which i the open dictatorship of the mos reactionary sections of finance capi tal. Capitalist culture had gone int a decline, marked among othe manifestations by the cutting dow and distortion of scientific investi gation and the growth of religiou superstition, medieval obscurantism and pagan mysticism.

This picture of economic, politi cal, and social degeneration i quite different from that at th beginning of the World War. Then although the world capitalist systen as a whole had already entered int its epoch of monopoly and decay and was sinking into its genera crisis, it still possessed great vital ity. The grip of the monopolies upon society was not nearly s strong as it is now. Many of th countries were still developing in dustrially, and none required th stimulus of the government lend ing-spending programs character istic of present-day capitalism Industrial crises were relatively short and readily overcome, a contrasted to the devastating, al most permanent economic collapse of today. There was no great con stant army of unemployed, and a least the upper layers of the work ing class enjoyed a comparatively high standard of life. The gold standard prevailed almost univer sally. World commerce was on much freer basis, and there was n talk of autarchy. In consequence o this better economic situation, capi talism did not yet so clearly show its decay politically and socially Treaties and international law stil had some validity, bourgeois de mocracy retained much vitality, and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the decay of science and culture was not so marked as today.

A basic result of the present weakened state of capitalism is greatly to sharpen all the economic and political antagonisms within the capitalist system; to render them deeper, more complex, and more clearly insoluble than they were in 1914. Thus, the class struggle between the capitalists and the toilers over the products of labor has grown far more acute. The antagonisms between the great capitalist powers and the colonial, semi-colonial and small capitalist countries have vastly sharpened. The conflicts between the capitalist imperialist powers themselves also have grown more profound, desperate, and all-pervading. And, lastly, of the most fundamental importance is the far-reaching and ever-deepening antagonism between the capitalist world and the Soviet Union.

War is therefore a far greater necessity for capitalism now, both politically and economically. Capitalist leaders are deluded by the futile hope that conquest and destruction can solve their deepening economic and political problems, their multiplying contradictions and antagonisms. Things have now come to the point where the great monopoly financiers, the rulers of the capitalist world, are almost as afraid of peace as of the consequences of war.

The central lesson to be drawn from this comparison is that the capitalist system, as it embarks upon its present cold-blooded imperialist slaughter, is structurally much more vulnerable both to the economic and military effects of the war and to the blows of the revolutionary forces. This is all the more true because modern war, with its greater mechanization, puts a much severer strain upon the capitalist economy and the general social system than war did a generation ago.

The Strengthened Anti-Capitalist Forces

Now we come to the counterpart of the weakened state of the capitalist system: the present greater strength of the anti-capitalist forces. This change also was produced by the deepening of the general capitalist crisis.

(A) *The Rise of the Soviet Union* —The greatest advance of the world's anti-capitalist forces since 1914, making for the establishment of international socialism, was the birth and growth of the U.S.S.R. This has enormously weakened the whole world capitalist system, economically and politically. The vast Soviet Union, extending over one-sixth of the habitable globe, has become a power so strong that no combination of capitalist countries has been capable of successfully attacking it. With its new socialist industries, the biggest in Europe, its modern collectivized agriculture and its powerful Red Army, it is an impregnable fortress of world socialism. Because of its growing strength and the fact that it is a living demonstration of the practicability of socialism, the U.S.S.R. constitutes a beacon light of hope and inspiration to uncounted millions of oppressed toilers through-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

out the world. It is playing a gigantic role in the growing struggle between the forces of capitalism and of world socialism.

(B) *The Awakening World Working Class*—The proletariat in the capitalist world has today greater revolutionary maturity than in 1914. Faced with mass unemployment, declining living standards, fascism and war, the workers in all capitalist countries are rapidly losing their bourgeois illusions. One striking expression of this is their almost universal recognition of the fact that capitalism cannot go along as before, creating new and seemingly endless vistas of development. They see capitalism now as stagnant and shriveling and as requiring constant financial shots-in-the-arm from the respective governments in order to keep going. Fewer and fewer workers now cherish the hope of one day becoming small manufacturers or shopkeepers, and millions have almost lost hope even of ever securing a steady job. Another expression of the workers' political maturing is their all-prevailing peace sentiment, their general opposition to the war, in belligerent as well as in neutral countries. They simply do not see that they have anything to fight for in this imperialist war. Never have the great mass of the workers in all countries had so little faith in the capitalist system as at the present time, and never was the awakening to class-consciousness so marked.

The workers' growing anti-capitalist moods internationally, confused though they may still be, represent a big advance over their political outlook at the outset of the World War. The workers at that time had not yet faced chronic industrial collapse, mass unemployment, fascism, and recurrent imperialist wars. The capitalist system by no means looked so hopeless to them as it does today. Ideologically, the working class everywhere is now much more prepared to perform its revolutionary role than it was a generation ago.

Moreover, today, the world workers have a more powerful political revolutionary movement than in 1914. True, at that time the Second International was composed of large political parties, trade unions, and cooperatives in nearly all European countries; it carried on Socialist agitation—of its own opportunist brand—and it adopted many ringing declarations against imperialist war, making a showy appearance of Socialist strength. But when the great test came in the World War and during the years following, the Second International demonstrated that it was neither Socialist nor anti-imperialist. Its decisive leadership gave full support to the imperialist war and used all its power to defend capitalism against the revolutionary upheavals at the end of the war. The truly revolutionary elements, those who understood and dared to take a stand against the war and for socialism had not yet crystallized into a revolutionary party. The one great exception was in Russia, where, under Lenin's and Stalin's leadership, they were strong enough to strike tsarism and capitalism to the ground and establish the Soviet Government.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Today, as the second imperialist war gets under way, the world proletariat is politically much stronger, possessing a real revolutionary vanguard. We now have the Communist International, with its leading detachment the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and its Communist Parties all over the capitalist world. Many of these parties are numerically and politically strong, and even those compelled to work underground are very influential among the masses. The organized Communists of today are giving incomparably stronger socialist leadership to the masses than could the scattered and inexperienced Left Socialists of early World War days.

The breakdown of the Second International in Germany, Austria, Poland and many other countries is not an indication that the revolutionary socialist forces have grown weaker. On the contrary, the controlling bureaucracy of the Second International, with its policy of reformism and class collaboration, was in 1914, and is today far more brazenly, part of the bourgeois camp. As capitalism declines and abolishes its limited democracy, so also its arm among the working class, the opportunist Social Democracy, decays simultaneously. The weakening of Social-Democracy is a phase of the weakening of the capitalist system itself. The true measure of world socialist strength is not the decadent, now counter-revolutionary, Second International, but the anti-capitalist forces analyzed in this section, whose world expression is the expanding Communist International.

(C) *Intensified National Revolutionary Movements*—The anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist forces have, moreover, been vastly strengthened since 1914 by the growth of national revolutionary movements in the colonial and semi-colonial lands. Thus, China is in open war for its national independence. India, too, is surging up and will soon begin to march militantly along the path of colonial revolution. French Indo-China and the Dutch East Indies are also stirring, and a long war in Europe will doubtless set them actively in struggle for independence. The Philippines and many Latin American countries also, during the past generation, have developed a new spirit of independence and are much more capable of resisting American and other imperialist domination.

These national revolutionary movements in the colonial and semi-colonial countries, only incipient at the beginning of the World War, today represent a grave danger to world imperialism, to world capitalism. They constitute a great reservoir of strength to the forces making for world socialism.

(D) *National Minorities and Small Capitalist Nations*—During the World War the oppressed national minorities were an important factor in disintegrating the empires of Russia, Germany, and Austria. But as the present war is beginning the national minorities are vastly more dangerous to the great empires. This is because they are today more heavily oppressed and also because they have all developed a far stronger spirit of national independence.

The national minority problem is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

being rendered still broader and more explosive by the fact that the great empires, under the pressure of the war and the world capitalist crisis generally, are swallowing up the smaller capitalist nations and transforming them into oppressed nations and national minorities to an extent quite unknown during the World War. Owing to the activities of Germany and Italy on the one side, and England and France on the other, the independence of every small nation in Europe is either already gone (Austria, Spain, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Albania, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium), or grievously menaced (Sweden, the Balkans, Switzerland). The United States is also actively seeking to reduce Latin America economically and politically to its sway, while Japan and the U.S.A. busy themselves along similar lines in the Far East. This increased oppression of national minorities and subjugation of small independent nations, which is characteristic of the present situation, bodes ill for the great empires in case of a devastating war.

(E) *The Growth of the People's Front*—Still another factor of importance is the powerful radical trend now evident among the poorer farmers and the lower urban petty-bourgeoisie. Pressed by the chronic agricultural crisis and the stranglehold of monopoly capital upon industry and trade, and faced by the dreaded perspectives of fascism and war, these sectors of the population have definitely sharpened their opposition to the big bankers, landlords, and industrialists. They are showing decided tendencies to make joint cause with the workers against the common big capitalist enemy. This trend is observable in many countries and its organized form is the people's front, powerful expressions of which have been seen in Spain, France, China, Mexico, and Chile, and in incipient forms in the United States.

Although, like the colonial and national liberation movements, the people's front does not of itself aim at socialist objectives, it must, like them, be counted an anti-capitalist force of major significance. The people's front directs its blows against finance capital, the backbone of war-making imperialism, weakening the foundation of modern capitalism, and thereby opening up the way for real advances toward socialism by the masses under the leadership of the revolutionary proletariat. Especially in the event of a destructive war, the people's front, with peace as its main issue, will play a big role in the developing class struggle.

The Two-Phased War Policy of World Imperialism

The war-making imperialists, rulers of the capitalist world, are quite conscious of the elementary facts presented above. They know that as this war is beginning the capitalist system is much weaker and the revolutionary forces are much stronger than they were at the outset of the World War. This realization shapes their political objectives in the war and modifies their military strategy.

Consequently, the imperialists of all countries, the United States in-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cluded, have a haunting dread of socialist revolution. They are afraid, and with good reason, that if the present hostilities develop into a mass slaughter such as that of 1914-18, or result in a similar economic exhaustion, the forces of socialism will put an end to capitalism.

When launching the World War, the butchers of the people had little or no fear of revolution, except in tsarist Russia. The German, British and French rulers correctly relied on the Social-Democratic leaders to sabotage the revolutionary movement. Certainly the American imperialists had not the slightest reason to doubt the loyalty of the A. F. of L. leadership. It was only after the Bolshevik Revolution in Russia that an acute fear of the revolution entered the heart of the world bourgeoisie. In the present war, however, the imperialists are already stricken with dread. This fear delayed the outbreak of the war; it was a factor in hindering the bombing of the industrial centers and the launching of a murderous offensive on the Western Front; it is causing the exclusion of Communists and other militant workers from the air service, tank corps, artillery and other key military branches in the belligerent countries; and it is already making the various governments, especially the American, think seriously about "reconstruction" measures after the war. Thus, while the World War at its inception was almost solely a conflict between the two rival groups of imperialist powers, the present war from the very beginning is not only a struggle between the imperialist powers, but also a struggle of world imperialism against the forces making for social revolution.

This fear of revolution, however, does not cause the imperialists to neglect their respective imperialistic designs upon each other and upon the weaker peoples. With Great Britain as the main war instigator, they murderously lunge into one another, while at the same time, in bourgeois-democratic as well as in fascist states, they try to stamp out the menacing fires of revolution. Thus in Germany, Italy and Japan, the workers face an iron repression. In England the government is using the Labor officialdom to hamstring the labor movement; the Communist Party is threatened with suppression. In France the Communist Party has been outlawed and opponents of the war face the death penalty. In the United States the Communists and other advanced workers are being hounded, and the M-Plan is ready for application. In Central Europe the German fascists and other reactionaries are also brutally repressing the restive national minorities, while England's abrupt rejection of India's demand for independence and the new aggressiveness of the United States towards Latin America are characteristic of the stiffer attitude now being taken generally by the imperialist powers towards the colonial and semi-colonial peoples.

The imperialists of all countries, while watchful to check very phase of the revolutionary movement, are agreed that the Soviet Union constitutes the main revolutionary danger. They see in it the great rallying

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

center for the world's oppressed—the workers and farmers of the capitalist countries, the great colonial masses, the downtrodden national minorities and the threatened weaker capitalist nations. They know too that the success of its socialist system constitutes a living exposure of the rottenness of capitalism. Further zest is lent to their anti-Soviet aims by the hope of one day dividing up the rich territories of the U.S.S.R. To smash the U.S.S.R., therefore, is the job which all the imperialists agree must eventually be done if they and their system are to remain safe. Hostility towards the Soviet Union is the element of unity in the policies of the world imperialists. It is an ever present factor, even in the midst of their bitterest internecine conflicts.

Great Britain, like its ally, France, has been an inveterate enemy of the Soviet Union and is the leader in the world capitalist attempt to destroy the great stronghold of socialism. It deliberately strengthened Hitler-Germany, with the intention of turning the fascist bayonets against the Soviet Union. Still clinging to this cold-blooded scheme to make the Soviet Union and Germany wear each other out in a war of attrition, England at Munich and thereafter rejected the U.S.S.R.'s offer of a powerful world peace front to halt the war and thereby assumed the chief responsibility for the outbreak of the present armed conflict. Now that the war is going on, England's central political strategy is to transform the struggle into a general capitalist war against the Soviet Union, by forcing Hitler or some puppet successor into an anti-Soviet war. Determination to protect and extend the British and French empires against the blows of German imperialism, and against the looming threat of the international revolutionary forces, makes the Allies almost desperate in their eagerness to realize their imperialist war against the U.S.S.R.

American imperialism, also with a record of bitter hatred of the Soviets ever since their establishment, is cooperating fully with the British and French imperialists in their war plots against the U.S.S.R. This was made quite clear, for instance, by Roosevelt's provocative and belligerent anti-Soviet policy during the Finnish conflict. What with denunciations of the Soviets war loans to Finland, Sweden, and Norway, the establishment of the "moral embargo," the encouragement of recruitment of volunteers, etc., Roosevelt's anti-Soviet policy verged upon open hostilities. The powerful capitalism of the United States has always been especially hostile towards the young socialist giant, the Soviet Union, and will let no opportunity pass to work for its destruction.

Fascist Germany, bound closely to its allies, Japan and Italy, in the anti-Comintern pact, and instigated by England, also actively pursued for several years the avowed policy of a general military crusade against the U.S.S.R. But Hitler had to abandon that policy for a number of very important reasons, among which were: the rapid increase in the economic strength of the Soviet Union and the growth of its Red

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Army; the smash-up of Hitler's Trotskyite-Zinovievite-Bukharinite agents; the bogging down of Japan in China and the weakening of Italy in the Ethiopian and Spanish wars; the fear that the German workers would rebel if they had to fight against the U.S.S.R.; and the growing realization that Germany, in a desperate war with the Soviets, would be sacrificing itself in the interests of British imperialism. Although Hitler was thus forced to call off his anti-Soviet war, it would be the height of folly to conclude therefrom that he has abandoned it finally. Hitler's strategy is to knock out England with a blitzkrieg and then to try to avoid the revolutionary consequences of the war by setting up a system of fascism to dominate Europe with the help of the fascist "fifth column" elements in the various countries.

By the Soviet-German pact and the Soviet-Finnish peace treaty, the U.S.S.R. dealt smashing defeats to the world imperialists in their attempts to destroy the Soviet Union. These victories made the position of the U.S.S.R. far stronger and rendered much more difficult the attack by the imperialists. But we must not assume that they have given up their nefarious plan. Even while the imperialists are warring like wolves against one another, the danger of their ganging up for a joint attack against the U.S.S.R. always remains acute.

Policies of the World Anti-Capitalist Forces

How are the anti-capitalist elements developing their policies in the war situation? In line with our previous analysis of the general status of these forces, we can best discuss them under three general headings:

(A) *The Role of the Soviet Union* —The U.S.S.R. has condemned this war as an imperialist struggle, for which Great Britain bears the major blame. It does not support either side. While the capitalist powers tear into one another, the U.S.S.R., with its Marxist-Leninist strategy, takes advantage of the capitalist contradictions to strengthen its positions and thus advance the interests of the international socialist and anti-imperialist forces. It continues to work for world peace as it has done consistently ever since its foundation in 1917, in inspiring the fight of the masses everywhere against the war, for a just peace, for socialism.

As recent events show, however, the Soviet Union's independent peace policy does not imply that country's standing passively by without regard to what is happening in the war. On the contrary, while maintaining neutrality in the imperialist war, the Soviet Union, as in the past, pursues an active policy in the interests of the world toilers. It has given real support to the peoples of Spain and China; it has taken active steps to improve its strategic position in the Baltic in the interests of peace; and it has employed its great Red Army to liberate the peoples of Western Byelorussia and Western Ukraine. Since the outbreak of the war, it has brought thirteen million people under the flag of socialism. Thus the Soviet Union sets the example to

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist forces the world over.

The policy of the U.S.S.R. carries with it the possibility of mobilizing, under Soviet leadership, the potentially irresistible world mass peace forces, which are at the same time the world anti-capitalist forces. Such a mobilization—of workers, farmers, oppressed nationalities, small nations and colonial peoples—could bring the war to a sudden halt. It would also make it impossible for the imperialists to put across another Versailles or super-Munich peace treaty. Should the war be prolonged, this force would constitute a threat to the very existence of the capitalist system.

(B) *The Workers and Other Toilers in the Imperialist Countries*—In the great capitalist countries, the policy of the proletariat and other toilers in their struggle against the war and against capitalism is summed up in the slogan of the Communist International, "For Peace, Bread, and Freedom." These demands express the fundamental needs of the masses in the present situation, and the longer and more destructive the war becomes the more potent they will grow in organizing the workers, the farmers, the intellectuals and other toiling elements in anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist struggle.

The fight for peace brings these masses into direct conflict with the imperialist war-makers and as the war goes on it will bring them into firmer unison, under class-conscious leadership, for the decisive struggle against the capitalist system itself. The fight for bread—for the living and working standards of the masses—is another broad road to direct struggle against the war and, eventually, against capitalism. The fight for freedom is at once a struggle in defense of the people's civil liberties, for national independence, for socialism.

(C) *The National Minorities, Small Nations and Colonial Peoples*—By bringing greater oppression to these groups, the war is inevitably throwing all of them increasingly into conflict with the imperialist powers. The fight against imperialism in this period of capitalist decay is in the long run a fight against capitalism itself. The oppressed peoples of the world will not be slow to take advantage of the difficulties of the imperialist masters as the war progresses. The raising of independence demands by India at this time is highly significant; it gives the correct cue for oppressed peoples of all categories throughout the world.

A factor of great importance in the increased movements of revolt and struggle among the colonial and other oppressed peoples is their tendency to turn towards the Soviet Union for help and leadership. The October Revolution and the peace policy of the Soviet Union are having profound repercussions among these peoples. China is the most outstanding example of the growing recognition that the U.S.S.R. is the only state that defends the weaker peoples. An expanding pro-Soviet sentiment is also in evidence among the Baltic, Balkan, Scandinavian and Latin American countries. As the war goes on this tendency is bound to increase. When peace is negotiated, the proposals

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the Soviet Union will have great support from the oppressed of the whole world. The turning of these peoples toward the Soviet Union, to prevent their being destroyed by the imperialist powers, ominously threatens the war-makers and their plans of capitalist exploitation.

The War Perspective

Because of the more advanced stage of the general crisis of the capitalist system, the tempo of the breakdown of capitalism and the growth of the revolutionary forces during this war will be much faster than it was in the World War. The World War gave capitalism a blow from which it has not recovered; the present war will deal it a still heavier blow. The capitalists' gnawing fear of revolution is well-founded.

One thing, however, is certain. Capitalism, as Lenin pointed out so many times, will never fall of itself. There can be no automatic victory for the forces heading towards socialism. The capitalists will fight to the end to maintain their rule. They will use every kind of military force, fascist demagogy and terrorism to suppress the people's discontent. The British tories, if successful in the war, would drive no less ruthlessly towards world fascism than would the German Nazis, in an endeavor to save the tottering capitalist system.

The extent to which this imperialist war will result in a further demolition of capitalism and enlargement of the socialist sector of the world will depend primarily on the degree to which the growing anti-capitalist forces can be strengthened, coordinated, and led in effective struggle. The world Communist movement is the only guarantee of accomplishing this.

As for the Second International, dominated as it is by reactionaries, it is a dangerous enemy of peace and socialism. Linked up with the bourgeoisie in the respective countries, its policy is one of supporting the war and of hampering all anti-imperialist, anti-capitalist struggle. In England and France the Social-Democrats are members of the bourgeois war cabinets; in Germany, and also in the United States and all non-belligerent capitalist countries they are openly supporting Allied imperialism. And everywhere their influence is being expended to prevent the growth and action of the revolutionary elements. The world Social-Democracy is a force, not for, but against, peace and socialism.

The war has already done colossal damage to the capitalist system and, even if halted now, would surely be followed by serious economic and political repercussions. And the prospect is that the war will be a protracted and devastating one.

The antagonisms between the warring imperialist powers have become so deep that it would be extremely difficult for these states to patch up even a temporary peace. A just and lasting peace can be achieved only if the workers and other toilers in England, Germany, France, the United States and Italy fire the Chamberlains, Hitlers, Roosevelts, Reynauds and Musso-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

linis, and similar agents of capitalism, get together with the peoples of the U.S.S.R., China, India, and Latin America, and, on the basis of progressive and socialist governments, crack the power of monopoly capital and work out a people's peace.

It is worth noting another element which operates against the imperialists' patching up an early peace. In spite of their fear of the revolution the imperialist rulers are still imbued with the belief that in a real pinch they could beat back the revolution through a combination of their military strength, and by methods of fascist terrorism and demagogy, aided by Social-Democratic treachery. They think that in a revolutionary crisis they could crush, or at least check, the Soviet Union, stifle the colonial movements, and stamp out the revolution among the workers. The betrayals by the Social-Democrats during the last war and the post-war revolutionary upheavals, when they saved European capitalism from the revolution, as well as their abject surrender to the rising Hitler in Germany and their traitorous endorsement of the present imperialist war, have bred in the tories of all countries a gross underestimation of the revolutionary strength of the workers and their allies. In the trap of this underestimation they may well meet their doom.

The Role of American Imperialism

In the imperialist war and in the far-reaching conflict between the world forces of reaction and of progress a most vital factor in determining the outcome will be the role played by American imperialism. As in the case of other capitalist powers, the policy of American imperialism is conditioned by the basic considerations of the weakened state of the capitalist system and the growing strength of the revolutionary forces. Hence, as American imperialism strives to advance its own interests it at the same time is alert to utilize every occasion to defeat the forces making towards world socialism.

On its own greedy account American imperialism is exploiting the war situation to reap huge profits from the sale of munitions and to seize all possible markets in Latin America and the Far East while its great rivals, England, Germany and Japan, are engaged in war. It is also seeking to strengthen itself politically internationally wherever it can. This time American imperialism, in consolidating its overlordship, is not going to rely, as it did during the World War, chiefly upon loans which can be repudiated. Now it is going in for territorial and other political guarantees. This explains the present great drive to strengthen American influence in Latin America, to extend its imperialist power in China, to take over the British, French and Dutch Islands in the Caribbean, to grab Greenland, and to establish an American protectorate over the Dutch East Indies. The aim of imperialist America is to win world domination for itself.

The Roosevelt Government, controlled by the greatest bankers and industrialists, is striving to further American imperialist interests and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to beat back the world revolutionary forces on the basis of a general policy of supporting Great Britain and France in the war. The United States is not a neutral power. It is militantly pro-Ally, but as yet not actually a belligerent. There was nothing neutral in the lifting of the arms embargo; the acceptance of the British blockade with little or no protest; the enforcement of the British blockade against the Soviet Union through the "moral embargo"; the financial support to the pound and the franc; the shipment of the most secret and best American war planes to the Allies; the ultra-hostile attitude against the U.S.S.R. in the Finnish situation; the anti-Soviet maneuverings with the Vatican; the violently pro-Ally war speeches and intrigues made by Ambassadors Bullitt, Kennedy and Cromwell; the curt rejection of the peace proposals of the U.S.S.R., Germany, and the Netherlands; the maneuvers to pull Italy into the camp of the Allies; and the repeated endeavors by the President to give ideological justification to the Allied cause. At the outset of the war the President said he was not neutral in thought, and he has followed this up by being thoroughly unneutral in action. He has, indeed, taken "all measures short of war" in support of the Allies and has already involved the country deeply into the war.

A number of basic factors lead the decisive sections of finance capital and their Roosevelt Government to adopt a pro-Ally course: (a) their desire to reap rich war profits through the munitions trade with the Allies and to protect American World War loans and foreign investments generally in the Allied countries and colonies; (b) their determination to occupy a key seat at the peace table to share the spoils of victory; (c) their active fear of the competitive power of a victorious imperialist Germany; and (d) their agreement with the anti-Soviet policy of the Allies. Furthermore, although American imperialism wants to clip Britain's wings, nevertheless it is moved to shield the British Empire (and its dependent French, Dutch, Belgian and Portuguese empires) from possible breakdown in the war, either through military defeat or by economic exhaustion. This is because the British Empire is the very cornerstone of the world capitalist system, the main enemy of everything progressive, and its serious weakening or overthrow by Hitler, or by the world revolutionary socialist forces, would shake the very foundations of the entire capitalist system.

It has become obvious that the Allies have little chance to win the war or even to stave off defeat without very substantial American assistance. Now they need airplanes; later it will be money, troops and warships. Although it will surely be tried, it will be difficult to get the American people to agree to war credits, which can only be outright war appropriations. Hence, all the greater the danger that a well-timed "incident" may be used to plunge this country into the hostilities. For the warmongers such a course would cut the Gordian knot of the people's resistance to the war.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The more the military difficulties of the Allies grow the greater is the danger of the United States being dragged fully into the war. There can be no doubt that the American imperialists and their government leader, President Roosevelt, have decided to enter the war with America's full forces on the side of the Allies when and if they deem it necessary. But the United States will make the Allies pay dearly for its "support." Clearly its aim is to muscle into domination over the associated empires of England, France, Holland, Belgium and Portugal.

The assertion that the United States, with its present government, can play a progressive role in the war is a gross lie. So far as the American people are concerned, military participation in the war could only bring to them the sacrifice of many American boys' lives, a dangerous suppression of the people's civil liberties, the destruction of vast quantities of commodities needed to feed the impoverished here, and the strengthening of reaction on all fronts.

In the international arena, also, American war participation would have deeply reactionary effects. It would tend to spread, deepen and prolong the war, and also to make it more dangerously counter-revolutionary. The United States, a great capitalist stronghold, could only serve in the war as an armed guard to protect the decaying capitalist system from the assaults of the oppressed and outraged masses of the world. American military forces would not be used to defend world democracy but to destroy it. They would be employed to protect the interests of American and British imperialism, to attack the Soviet Union, and to beat down revolutionary and democratic movements in all the capitalist and colonial countries. At the peace table, also, the delegates from the present American government would be the enemies of the workers and peasants of the world, the powerful defenders of the rotting capitalist system.

During and after the World War, the United States played a reactionary role, not only in general by its entry into the war, but also specifically by such acts as its participation in the formulation of the infamous Versailles Treatry, in the armed intervention against the Soviet Government, in strangling the Hungarian revolution, and in the post-war enslavement of the German people through the Young and Dawes Plans. In the present war the role of the United States would be even more militantly reactionary, because finance capital now has a greater grip on the country and its imperialist appetite is thoroughly whetted; but most of all because the weakened world capitalist system is in great danger from the strengthened revolutionary forces, and the United States would use all its power to save it.

The fight to keep this country out of the war can be won. The overwhelming masses of the people are definitely against American participation in the war. But to make their peace desires prevail these must be translated into active struggle against the war. Only by such determined action can they win against

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the imperialists who, step by step, are involving the country in the war behind a smoke-screen of hypocritical slogans about peace and neutrality, and who are daily becoming bolder in advocating war loans, the "limited war," and other active military aid to the Allies.

To defeat the imperialist warmongers, the insidious war policy of President Roosevelt must be exposed and the people awakened to its grave danger. Every step taken by the government into the war must meet the organized opposition of the masses. This fight against the war can have a broad backing only if it is linked up with all the struggles of the masses for their immediate economic and political demands: to prevent the economic burdens of the war from being loaded upon the workers; for better wages and shorter hours; for the organization of the unorganized; for trade union unity; for jobs and unemployment relief; for the defense of civil liberties; in support of existing progressive labor legislation; against profiteering in life necessities; for a third, progressive party. All this must lead to the establishment of an anti-imperialist people's front, which would work with other progressive forces throughout the world for a just peace. In this great work of education, organization and struggle the Communist Party bears a central responsibility to give the masses correct and resolute leadership.

The fight to keep America out of the war is of historic importance. It is vital to the national interests of the American people. It is also fundamental to the success of the anti-capitalist forces of the whole world that the reactionary weight of the United States shall not be thrown against them in their struggle to free themselves during and after this war.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

LENIN ON THE WORLD IMPERIALIST WAR

Speech Delivered at an International Meeting in Berne, February 8, 1916

BY V. I. LENIN

COMRADES! The European war has been raging for more than eighteen months. And as each month, as each day of the war goes by, it becomes clearer and clearer to the masses of the workers that the Zimmerwald Manifesto expressed the truth when it declared that phrases about "defense of the fatherland" and the like are nothing but capitalist deception. It is becoming more evident every day that this is a war *between capitalists, between big robbers,* who are quarrelling over the loot, each striving to obtain the largest share, the largest number of countries to plunder, and the largest number of nations to suppress and enslave.

It may sound incredible, especially to Swiss comrades, but it is nevertheless true that *in Russia,* also, not only bloody tsarism, not only the capitalists, but also a section of the so-called or ex-Socialists say that Russia is fighting a "war of defense," that Russia is only fighting against German invasion. The whole world knows, however, that for decades tsarism has been oppressing more than a hundred million people belonging to other nationalities in Russia; that for decades Russia has been pursuing a predatory policy towards China, Persia, Armenia and Galicia. *Neither Russia, nor Germany, nor any other Great Power has the right to claim that it is waging a "war of defense";* all the Great Powers are waging an imperialist, capitalist war, a predatory war, a war for the oppression of small and foreign nations, a war for the sake of the profits of the capitalists, who are coining golden profits amounting to billions out of the appalling sufferings of the masses, out of the blood of the proletariat.

Four years ago, in November, 1912, when it had become clear that war was approaching, the representatives of the Socialist Parties of the whole world gathered at the International Congress in Basle. Even at that time there was no room for doubt that the impending war would be a war between the Great Powers, between the great beasts of prey; that responsibility for the war would rest upon the governments and the capitalist classes of *all* the Great Powers. The Basle Manifesto, which was adopted *unanimously* by the Socialist Parties of the whole world, openly stated this truth. *The Basle Manifesto does not say a word*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about a "war of defense," or "defense of the fatherland." It castigates the governments and the bourgeoisie of *all* the Great Powers without exception. It said openly that war would be the greatest of crimes, that the workers would consider it a crime to shoot one another, that the horrors of war and the indignation these would rouse among the workers would inevitably lead to a *proletarian revolution.*

When the war actually broke out it was realized that its character had been correctly defined at Basle. But the Socialist and labor organizations were not unanimous in carrying out the Basle decisions; they split. We see now that in all countries of the world the Socialist and labor organizations are split into two big camps. The smaller section, the leaders, functionaries and officials, have betrayed socialism and have deserted to the side of the governments. Another section, to which the mass of class conscious workers belong, continues to gather its forces, to fight against the war and for the proletarian revolution.

The view of this latter section also found expression in the Zimmerwald Manifesto.

In Russia, from the very beginning of the war, the *workers' deputies* in the Duma waged a determined revolutionary struggle against the war and the tsarist monarchy. Five workers' deputies—Petrovsky, Badayev, Muranov, Shagov and Samoilov—distributed revolutionary manifestoes against the war and energetically carried on revolutionary agitation. Tsarism ordered the arrest of those five deputies, put them on trial, and sentenced them to lifelong exile in Siberia. For months the leaders of the working class of Russia have been pining in Siberia; but their cause has not gone under; their work is being continued by the class conscious workers all over Russia.

Comrades: You have heard the speeches of representatives of various countries, who have told you about the workers' revolutionary struggle against the war. I merely want to quote one other example from that great and rich country, the United States of America. The capitalists of that country are now making enormous profits out of the European war. And they, too, are agitating for war. They say that America must also prepare to take part in the war, hundreds of millions of dollars must be squeezed out of the people for new armaments, for armaments without end. And in America, too, a section of the Socialists echoes this false, criminal appeal. But I will read to you what Comrade Eugene Debs, the most popular leader of the American Socialists, the Presidential candidate of the American Socialist Party, writes. In the American paper, *The Appeal to Reason*, September 11, 1915, he says:

"I am not a capitalist soldier; I am a proletarian revolutionist. I do not belong to the regular army of the plutocracy, but to the irregular army of the people. I refuse to obey any command to fight for the ruling class. . . . I am opposed to every war but one; I am for that war with heart and soul; and that is the world-wide war of the social revolution. In that war I am prepared to fight in any way the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ruling class may make it necessary. . . ." *

This is what Eugene Debs, the American Bebel, the beloved leader of the American workers, writes to them.

This again shows you, comrades, that in all countries of the world real preparations are being made to rally the forces of the working class. The horrors of war and the sufferings of the people are incredible. But we must not, and we have no reason whatever to view the future with despair.

The millions of victims who will fall in the war, and as a consequence of the war, will not fall in vain. The millions who are starving, the millions who are sacrificing their lives in the trenches, are not only suffering, but they are also gathering strength, are pondering over the real cause of the war, are becoming more determined and are acquiring a clearer revolutionary understanding. Rising discontent of the masses, growing ferment, strikes, demonstrations, protests against the war—all this is taking place in all countries of the world. And this is the guarantee that the European war will be followed by the proletarian revolution against capitalism.

Berner Tagwacht, No. 33,
February 9, 1916.

* E. V. Debs, *Speeches*, p. 65. International Publishers, New York, 1928.—*Ed.*

LENIN SPEAKS OF DEBS

BY ALEXANDER TRACHTENBERG

FOLLOWING a meeting of the International Socialist Commission held on February 8, 1916, in Berne, Switzerland, an international meeting dealing with the imperialist war which was then raging in Europe was held at which representatives of various Socialist Parties spoke. Lenin, a member of the Commission, was one of the speakers at that meeting—representing the Russian Bolsheviks. He spoke in German and the speech was printed in the official organ of the Swiss Socialist Party, the *Berner Tagwacht (Berne Guardian)*. The translation is from the original German.

Lenin quotes from an article by Eugene Debs which appeared in the *Appeal to Reason*, a popular weekly Socialist paper which was published in Girard, Kansas, and which had a wide circulation among the city workers and the farmers throughout the country. Some issues of the *Appeal* reached, in circulation, as high as a million copies. Lenin referred on several occasions to the *Appeal to Reason*, especially to its popular character and large circulation.

The article which was published in the September 11 issue of 1915, and which Lenin made historic by quoting from it at the international anti-war meeting at Berne, had its

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

own history. During the years 1915-16, while the first imperialist war was raging in Europe, the American press carried on a great campaign for military preparedness. Already then the imperialist interests were working to bring the United States into the war on the side of Allied imperialism, even as they are doing today. The militant *Appeal to Reason* was engaged in a fight against the preparedness campaign. It published a mass edition of the paper, calling it the "Jingo" edition, which it advertised widely several weeks before in order to secure the maximum circulation. Warren and Wayland, who managed the paper, were a great team with a genius in finding popular issues and securing mass support for the "Little Old Appeal" as it was affectionately known among the masses at the time.

Gene Debs was a constant contributor to the *Appeal* and it was natural that he should write an article against war for the "Jingo" edition of the paper which was issued on August 28, 1915. The article was entitled "Never Be a Soldier." In it he characterized the soldier as "the hired assassin of his capitalist master," and he called upon every worker "never to become a soldier and never to go to war." These and other expressions in his article were considered by many readers as being pacifist, and many workers wrote to Debs and to the *Appeal* expresing their disapproval. Debs was very much moved by this criticism; he was always responsive to the reaction of the masses. Two weeks later he published his reply to the criticism in the issue of September 11.

At the very beginning of his reply, he states the reason for his writing the article:

"Since my characterization of the soldier in the Jingo edition, I have been asked if I was opposed to all war and if I would refuse to be a soldier and to fight under any circumstances, and to make my answer through the *Appeal to Reason*."

He continued by giving the following answer:

"No, I am not opposed to all war, nor am I opposed to fighting under all circumstances, and any declaration to the contrary would disqualify me as a revolutionist. When I say I am opposed to war I mean ruling class war, for the ruling class is the only class that makes war. It matters not to me whether this war be offensive or defensive, or what other lying excuse may be invented for it, I am opposed to it, and I would be shot for treason before I would enter such a war. If I were in Congress, I would be shot before I would vote a dollar for such a war."

Two years later, when American imperialism forced the United States to enter the war, Debs repeated his uncompromising stand against imperialist war and for that, at the age of 65, he was sentenced to the Federal penitentiary for ten years under the "New Freedom" administration of Woodrow Wilson.

Lenin quoted two paragraphs from the Debs article. The last sentence of the first paragraph reads in full in the original as follows: "I refuse to obey any command to fight from the ruling class, *but I will not wait to be commanded to fight for the working class*."

The last sentence of the second paragraph reads in full in the orig-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inal as follows: "In that war I am prepared to fight in any way the ruling class makes it necessary, *even to the barricades.*"

Following the part of the article which Lenin quoted in his speech, Debs said: "There is where I stand and where I believe the Socialist Party stands, or ought to stand, on the question of war." The history of the position of the leadership of the Socialist Party on the question of war and similar burning problems affecting the masses of the working people during and since the World War is well known. The emergence and growth of the Communist Party was a result of this.

In France, Leon Blum and Paul Faure; in England, Clement Attlee and Herbert Morrison have summoned their parties to service in behalf of French and British imperialism just as the leaders of the same parties did twenty-five years ago. Five Labor Party leaders enter the British Cabinet and Attlee becomes Assistant Prime Minister. To explain away this position to the workers, Harold J. Laski, ideological leader of the Labor Party, is even ready to stake his "Marxist" scholarship and predict that British capitalism will abdicate immediately after it has defeated its imperialist rivals and that "socialism in our time" will be at last realized!

Only the heroic Communist Parties in France and England, as well as in Germany, remain loyal to their socialist ideals and are bringing to the masses the slogans of opposition to imperialism and its criminal designs. As against the few Karl Liebknechts at the beginning of the last war, thousands of them are today fighting to prevent the war from spreading and to bring the carnage to an end altogether.

American Social-Democracy in common with their brethren abroad is today whooping it up for the second imperialist war, calling for a class peace and aggression against the Soviet Union.

Forgotten are the St. Louis Resolution, Debs, Ruthenberg and scores of other Socialists who languished in jail for their uncompromising anti-war stand in 1917-18. Under pressure of the St. Louis Resolution, even the Centrist Hillquit was compelled publicly to refuse to buy war bonds during his New York mayoralty campaign in the summer of 1917; this must be bringing horrible memories to the "Socialist" advance guard of the war party in the United States.

Remembering Debs' internationalist stand during the last war and his militant socialism throughout his active political career in the labor movement, can anyone doubt that his tradition belongs today to the Communist Party?

The complete speech made by Lenin at Berne is included in Volume XIX of his *Collected Works* which will be published shortly, by International Publishers. The volume contains the writings of Lenin during 1916 and the first part of 1917, up to the February Revolution. The translation of this volume was made by the late M. J. Olgin. With the Lenin writings already available on the first imperialist war, Volume XIX of the *Collected Works* will be an addition to the righ literary heritage he left to the world working class.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

IMPERIALIST WAR AND "DEMOCRATIC" DEMAGOGY

BY GIL GREEN

WITH the extension of the theater of war to the Scandinavian and Low Countries, the imperialist carnage has entered a new and bloodier stage, in which the attempts to involve the United States as a belligerent will become even more brazen. This can be seen in the attempts to conjure up before the masses the nightmare of a Hitler victory and to misdirect their democratic and anti-fascist sentiments in order to weaken their resistance to becoming engulfed in the imperialist war.

The fact that 96 per cent of the American people want to stay out of the war does not offer in itself a guarantee that the warmongers may not succeed. For, despite this great anti-war sentiment, the Roosevelt Administration has already committed this country and its resources to the Allied imperialist camp. And it must be admitted that while larger masses view the foreign and domestic policies of the Administration with increasing concern, millions who want no part of the war do not yet see clearly that the Government's course is leading this country into the war.

The American bourgeoisie has not yet succeeded in selling the European war to the American masses as a holy crusade, but it has influenced many in the belief that an Allied imperialist victory is to be desired. Many workers who have no earthly use for the British Empire and its Tory ruling class, none the less honestly believe that a British victory would guarantee democratic rule.

This influence of pro-Allied war propaganda consciously disseminated by the Roosevelt Administration, the bourgeois press and the Social-Democratic lackeys of imperialism; this fallacy of the "lesser evil" is the hole in the dike through which are pouring the flood-waters of war involvement.

I.

A German imperialist victory would mean continuation and extension of tyrannical rule, national oppression, and capitalist exploitation. It would only bring new imperialist wars in its train. Of this there can be no doubt.

But would an Allied imperialist victory bring different results? Would it bring a lasting or just peace? Would it end fascism? Would it maintain or strengthen

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

democracy—even limited bourgeois democracy—in Germany and in Europe as a whole? These are the questions that need an answer; for, those who contend that an Allied victory would mean these things either willfully mislead the masses or betray a palpable ignorance of the causes and nature of the present conflict and of fascism.

The present European war is an inevitable product of capitalist society, particularly in its imperialist stage, when powerful monopolies and banks assume a dominant role. The *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union,* tracing the historical development of imperialism and the basic causes of imperialist conflicts, states:

"Finance capital became master in the capitalist states. Finance capital demanded new markets, the seizure of new colonies, new fields for the export of capital, new sources of raw material.

"By the end of the nineteenth century the whole territory of the globe had been divided up among the capitalist states. Yet in the era of imperialism the development of capitalism proceeds extremely unevenly and by leaps: some countries, which previously held a foremost position, now develop their industry at a relatively low rate, while others, which were formerly backward, overtake and outstrip them by rapid leaps. The relative economic and military strength of the imperialist states was undergoing a change. There arose a striving for a redivision of the world, and the struggle for this redivision made imperialist wars inevitable. The war of 1914 was a war for the redivision of the world and of spheres of influence. All the imperialist states had long been preparing for it. The imperialists of all countries were responsible for the war." (pp. 160-61.)

From 1870 to 1900 alone, Britain added 4,754,000 square miles of territory and 88,000,000 people to her gigantic empire. From 1884 to 1900, France acquired 3,583,580 square miles and a population of 36,553,000. Germany, one of the last of the great European states to become a modern industrial power, got the leavings of the robber spoils, and in this same period gained 1,026,220 square miles and a population of 16,687,100.*

German imperialism, in striving for new markets, for new fields for the export of capital, and for new sources of raw material, was therefore at a disadvantage as against her older imperialist rivals, especially her main European rival, Great Britain. For there were no "unoccupied" territories left for her to occupy, as Britain had done a century before, since the whole world was by now divided among the imperialist giants. She could find her place in the imperialist sun only by seeking a *re*division of the territories of the globe in her favor. As Lenin succinctly explained in his *Imperialism:*

"For the first time the world is completely divided up, so that in the future *only redivision* is possible; territories can only pass from one 'owner' to another, instead of passing as unowned territory to an 'owner.'" (*Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism,* p. 76.)

* *Cf.*, Major General J. F. C. Fuller, *War and Western Civilization,* cited by R. Palme Dutt in *World Politics,* p. 32, International Publishers, New York.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That the last World War was just such a conflict for a redivision of the territories of the globe, that it was a predatory imperialist war in which moral issues played no part whatsoever, except as demagogy, was admitted by the bourgeoisie itself as soon as the war was over. Woodrow Wilson, on his return from Versailles, told the American people: "This war, in its inception was a commercial and industrial war. . . ." And we have none other than Lloyd George to thank for the admission that the present war is but a continuation of the World War of 1914-18. Nor does this latter die-hard imperialist bandit labor under any illusions as to the character of the last war, of which this is but a continuation. While still flushed with the victory of Versailles, Lloyd George thus summed up the "achievements" of four years of unprecedented slaughter:

"The truth is that we have got our way. We have got most of the things we set out to get."

Was he by any chance referring to democracy? To peace? Oh no! For these were not the things the Allied imperialists had set out to get. They were after far more tangible and prosaic objectives, as we can see from the following illuminating passage:

"The German navy has been handed over, the German mercantile shipping has been handed over, and the German colonies have been given up. One of our chief trade competitors has been most seriously crippled, and our Allies are about to become her biggest creditors. *This is no small achievement.*" *

Thus did the war leader of British imperialism join hands with Woodrow Wilson in admitting, after the event, the imperialist, predatory character of the last war and of its "peace."

This Allied victory, and its imperialist "peace," together with the betrayal of the German revolution by Social-Democracy, laid the basis for the rise of German fascism and the victory of Hitler. German imperialism, which entered the last World War to redivide the territories of the globe in its own interests, lost the war. Instead of winning new colonies, new markets, and spheres of influence, it lost its mercantile fleet and its former world markets, colonies and spheres of influence. Instead of winning war booty at the expense of British, French and American capital, it was reduced to a second-rate imperialist power, German territory was annexed, and reparations to the tune of one hundred billion dollars were imposed upon the German people. Thus stripped and shackled by its imperialist victors, German capitalism could solve neither its internal nor external problems. Germany became the weakest link in the world imperialist chain.

There was but one basic solution for the German masses: social revolution. But the Allied imperialists who were so anxious to destroy the power of their German imperialist rival were horrified at the prospect

* From Lord Riddell's *Intimate Diary of the Peace Conference and After*. Cited in *World Politics* by R. Palme Dutt, p. 58 (Our emphasis—*G.G.*)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the destruction of German capitalism. More than the devil himself they feared the German proletarian revolution; for, as Lloyd George put it, "If Germany is seized by the Communists, Europe will follow." (House of Commons, November 28, 1934.) A similar reactionary class policy motivated all American foreign affairs, as proved by an assertion of Herbert Hoover, in 1921:

"The whole of American policy during the liquidation of the Armistice was to contribute everything it could to prevent Europe from going Bolshevik." (Louis Fischer, *The Soviets in World Affairs*, Vol. I, p. 174.)

(Yes, everything, including the sending of American troops in the undeclared war of intervention against the new-born Socialist Republic.)

Immediately following the war, the Allied imperialists placed their faith in German Social-Democracy and gave it full support. When it became obvious that Social-Democracy could no longer keep the German masses in check, especially following the disastrous effects upon Germany of the world economic crisis which broke out in 1929 decisive sections of British and American finance capital threw their support to the fascists. Hitler came to power with the financial support of the Bank of England and with the political assistance of 10 Downing Street.

German fascism is not therefore the product of any individual's lust for power, as some would have us believe, or an expression of the "barbaric German people," as the British arch warmonger Alfred Duff Cooper has so cynically declared. It is the product of capitalism in crisis and decay, of the reactionary bourgeoisie unable to rule except through a terroristic regime at home and an aggressive imperialist policy abroad.

Lenin, in his monumental classic, *State and Revolution*, taught that under normal conditions the bourgeoisie prefers to rule through a parliamentary republic because "a democratic republic is the best possible shell for capitalism." But for German capitalism this was no longer the "best possible shell." Referring to the rise of German fascism, Comrade Stalin said in 1934 that it was:

"A symptom of the fact that the bourgeoisie is already unable to rule by the old methods of parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy, and, as a consequence, is compelled in its home policy to resort to terroristic methods of administration. . . ." *

Hitler did not *win* power either by an electoral plurality or by force of arms. Power was *given* him by the reactionary German bourgeoisie through the instrumentality of Hindenburg, with the approval of British finance capital, and with the connivance and compliance of the leaders of German Social-Democracy, who, by their theory of the "lesser evil," paved the way for the victory of fascism.

Hitler came to power to achieve two objectives: to crush the Ger-

* Report to the Seventeenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, in *Socialism Victorious*, p. 12, International Publishers, New York.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man working class movement and to win back for German imperialism the position it had lost during the World War. Even in respect to this second objective Hitler had the cooperation of British finance capital. The British ruling class had not suffered a change of heart nor was it ready to share world power with its imperialist rival. Britain permitted Germany to rearm, gave her loans and credits, encouraged her to one aggressive act after another with the sole objective of turning her against the Soviet Union. British imperialism hoped thereby to crush the Land of Socialism and at the same time to weaken its own German imperialist rival through a protracted war, without soiling its own lily-white hands or endangering its empire.

As the whole world knows today, Hitler went back on his original promise to Chamberlain. This is what makes Hitler a scoundrel in the eyes of British imperialism; for had there been honor among thieves this could not have happened! Hitler changed his mind because he realized that war against the Soviet Union would be the height of folly on his part. The Soviet Union had become the strongest industrial power in Europe. By its successful policy of collectivization it had destroyed the last economic foundation for class divisions within its borders. By ruthlessly liquidating the Trotskyite-Bukharinite scum of spies, traitors and agents-provocateurs, it had destroyed the "Fifth Column" of foreign powers.

British imperialism was now to reap what it had sowed. It had sowed the wind and reaped a whirlwind. By its anti-Soviet, anti-working class policies, it only succeeded in rehabilitating its old, once defeated, imperialist rival.

It was then confronted with the alternative of sharing world power with Germany or fighting the imperialist war of 1914-18 all over again, but under less favorable conditions. It chose the latter.

II

Those who are foolhardy enough to argue the necessity of an Allied imperialist victory should therefore be prepared to answer the following questions: Will it end the struggle for world markets, spheres of influence, and sources of raw material? Will it solve the basic contradiction of capitalism, the irreconcilable disparity between the social character of production and the private ownership of the means of production? Will it abolish the general crisis of world capitalism, which expresses itself in more frequent and prolonged cyclical economic crises, in mass unemployment, in imperialist wars? And if an Allied imperialist victory does none of these, what sane reason is there for believing that the basic roots of fascism, of reactionary oppressive regimes generally, will either be weakened or destroyed? What reason is there for believing that any kind of durable peace—not to speak of a just peace—can be achieved?

In seeking answers to these questions, it would be well to recall the harsh lessons learned from the last World War, which was ostensibly fought to "end all war," to "save the world for democracy,"

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to put an end to "Prussian militarism." Did an Allied imperialist victory achieve these professed objectives? It only succeeded in sharpening existing class relations, intensifying imperialist rivalries, and planting the very seeds which have now blossomed forth in this second imperialist war. Well did Stalin state at the Seventeenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union:

"What guarantee is there that the second imperialist war will produce 'better' results . . . ? Would it not be more correct to assume that the opposite will be the case?"

All the prattle about a "just peace" (as if any peace could be just under capitalism!), about "ending Hitlerism," about a "United States of Europe," cannot obscure certain essential facts. Will Britain, if she is victorious, give away colonies, markets and spheres of influence to the vanquished imperialist rival? It would be the sheerest nonsense to believe that she would. Every imperialist power holds on to what it has while striving to ensnare and devour more. Morals do not enter into this matter. Imperialism can survive only by continual struggle for a greater and greater *monopoly* of the markets and raw materials of the globe. This is even more true today than in 1914-18. British imperialism, which has had the lion's share of the spoils, possessing the greatest empire in the world, enslaving 500,000,000 colonial people, seeks *more* markets and spheres of influence in order to pull itself out of the economic tailspin in which it has been ever since the last World War. Is it not then folly to think in terms of imperialist magnanimity?

The *whole* capitalist world is in profound crisis. World capitalism finds it impossible to overcome the ever-growing antagonism between the expanding productive forces released by monopoly capital and the constant shrinkage of world market possibilities. This shrinkage is due to the fact that the entire globe has already been partitioned. It is due to the fact that imperialism constantly lowers the living standards of the toiling masses of both the imperialist and colonial countries; standards which have declined catastrophically since the last war because of the existence of large-scale permanent mass unemployment in all capitalist countries. But it is also due to still another factor that did not obtain in 1914. Imperialism is no longer master over the whole world. One-sixth of the surface of the globe and 180,000,000 people have been removed from the sphere of capitalist economy and imperialist rule. Two antagonistic and irreconcilable social systems now exist side by side: the world of declining capitalism and the world of advancing socialism. This struggle between the two rival social systems is the main contradiction, the main conflict in the world today.

Britain's war aims prove this. The British imperialists wish to see in Germany a regime, based on capitalism, that will subordinate itself to their policy, and complete

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

their plan of a march on the East. They wish Germany once more to become a spearhead against the Soviet Union, helping to destroy the Land of Socialism whose very existence world imperialism knows to be a mortal threat. Certainly, therefore, Britain would not want to add to the strength of socialism by permitting the establishment of a free working class in a socialist Germany. But if the German masses take that course none the less, as they eventually must, British imperialism would with its own hands, if possible, thrust into power a new Hitler, a new and even more brutal dictatorship over the German people.

This anti-Soviet design explains why Sir Neville Henderson in his recent book, *Failure of a Mission*, finds so much that is laudable in the Nazi regime and its leading personalities. His disagreement is solely with Nazi foreign policy—specifically with its refusal to honor the promissory note of Munich—the pledge to march against the East. That is also why Chamberlain and Churchill direct their main attacks against "Hitlerism" and not against fascism, for fascism has its "good" sides, you know!

In this connection something should be said about the "United States of Europe" panacea which has been welcomed with such alacrity in American "liberal" circles. As early as 1915, Lenin, in condemnation of Trotsky's position, pointed out that a federation of European states based on national independence and the equality of nations was a fantastic utopia under capitalism. Lenin wrote:

"From the point of view of the economic conditions of imperialism, *i.e.*, capital export and division of the world between the 'progressive' and 'civilized' colonial powers, the United States of Europe under capitalism is either impossible or reactionary." (V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. XVIII, pp. 269-70.)

This statement has special significance for today. What Lenin meant by "reactionary" he explained further:

". . . the United States of Europe as the result of an agreement between the European capitalists is possible, but what kind of agreement would that be? An agreement to suppress socialism in Europe. . . ." (p. 271.)

Lenin's prognosis was proved correct by the events following the conclusion of the World War. Although a United States of Europe was not established, a loose federation of states was created—the League of Nations. A central purpose of the League was to combat socialism in Europe and in the first place the new-born Soviet state. The armed intervention against the Soviet Union from 1918 to 1921; the establishment of the *cordon sanitaire*, an encirclement of the first proletarian state aimed at isolating it from the revolutionary masses of post-war Germany and Central Europe—these were all part of this *reactionary temporary agreement* of the European capitalist states.

Can this slogan have any meaning other than this today? If anything, it has an even more reactionary meaning. In the twenty-two years that have passed since the conclusion of the last war much

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has happened. The League of Nations is dead, even if not yet buried; the Versailles Treaty is worth less than the paper it is written on; the *cordon sanitaire* has been swept aside by the growing might of the Soviet Union; and the Munich four-power anti-Soviet agreement has been nullified by the Soviet-German Non-Aggression Pact. When these facts are seen against the background of a maturing European revolutionary crisis, the proposal for a United States of Europe takes on a particularly ominous and sinister meaning: first, because it can be realized only by the establishment of British imperialist hegemony over all capitalist Europe, especially over the dismembered and prostrate body of the German nation; and, secondly, because its two-edged purpose would be to subdue the revolutionary upsurge which is bound to sweep Europe as a result of the war and to turn a "united" capitalist Europe towards war against the Soviet Union.

The realization of this innocent-sounding slogan under capitalism would therefore have an effect opposite to that pictured by the master-minds of the *Nation* and *New Republic*. It would place Europe in the grip of counter-revolution of a White Terror more ferocious than any the world has ever witnessed. It would be "unity" ruled by the British Lion! It would be the combination of a super-Versailles and a super-Munich imposed by force over the states and peoples of Europe!

III

Nor can the Social-Democratic and liberal "champions" of bourgeois democracy claim with any truth that an Allied imperialist victory would benefit or promote the democratic aspirations of the peoples of Britain and France. It must be remembered that the present imperialist conflict is the logical culmination of the world crisis of the capitalist system and finds its sharpest expression in the imperialist belligerent states. The bourgeoisie in *all* of these states find it more and more difficult to rule in the old way, and this holds for the lands of traditional bourgeois democracy no less than for the others.

How does the internal regime of France today differ from that of Germany? French finance capital has destroyed the democratic liberties and the social gains of the toilers in the best Hitlerian fashion. Thousands of anti-war fighters are sentenced to prisons and concentration camps; the heroic Communist Party is hunted down; Communist deputies representing 1,500,000 French voters, are deprived of traditional Parliamentary immunity and thrown into dungeons; death penalty is the governmental threat for the distribution of leaflets calling for peace; the trade union movement has been transformed into a French replica of the German "Labor Front," into a government adjunct; and a moratorium has been declared upon elections. The only remaining point of difference between the internal regimes of Germany and France is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that in the former there is a parliament made up of only one bourgeois party while in France there is a parliament composed of all the bourgeois parties—and that most insidious lackey of the warmongering bourgeoisie, the Socialist Party. This is the sum and substance of French bourgeois democracy today. A fraud and mockery!

Britain is likewise following in the footsteps of its imperialist partner in crime. If its actions against the anti-war forces have not yet been as sweeping as those in France, this is not to be explained by the "liberalism" of its bourgeoisie, but by its reliance upon the relatively stronger influence of British Social-Democracy to keep the masses in check. As soon as the British reactionary bourgeoisie finds it necessary to duplicate the French example in all its sordid details, it will not need to look to Hitler for advice; it will but fall back on its own experience garnered from hundreds of years of oppressive dictatorial rule over the Irish and colonial peoples of the Empire. For the vaunted bourgeois democracy of Great Britain weighs like a feather in the scale against the dictatorial violence directed against the colonial hundreds of millions.

In the United States as well, this same anti-democratic trend is to be noted, despite the fact that this country is still a non-belligerent. Hence, the new reactionary program of the Roosevelt Administration, the witch hunts and persecutions undertaken by the Dies Committee and the Department of Justice.

Let no one make the mistake of thinking that these repressive activities can be explained by the exigencies of a war situation alone. Who ever heard of democracy being fought for through the destruction of democracy? Progressive wars base themselves on the popular will of the people and are won only by encouraging and harnessing the revolutionary initiative and enthusiasm of the masses. Only reactionary wars, wars waged against the interests of the people, are faced with the necessity of curbing the democratic movement of the masses and destroying the rights of the toiling millions. This is the lesson of the American Civil War, of the historic fight of the Spanish Republic, of the present heroic struggle of the Chinese people.

In the second place, if the present war ends in an imperialist victory —whether Allied or German—does anyone seriously believe that the capitalist system, both economically and politically, could return to so-called normalcy? Only the deluded or the smug philistine can believe that the masses, if again dragged through the inferno of a gigantic slaughter, will politely refrain from venting their indignation upon those responsible for the war, or will quietly accept the starvation and even greater mass unemployment inevitable in the wake of the armed conflict. That did not happen after the last war, and it certainly will not happen after this war, for the present conflict is far from a carbon copy of that of 1914-18. First, the people on both sides of the imperialist conflict have not been infected with war hysteria and super-patriotism. Secondly, in all imperialist countries there now

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

exist Communist Parties that have proved their mettle and who will never surrender to their ruling classes. Thirdly, the colonial masses are preparing to force the issue of independence during this crisis of world imperialism. Fourthly, capitalism can no longer rely upon Social-Democracy to the same degree as heretofore, even though Social-Democracy and its pernicious influence still remain the chief and must dangerous enemy to be fought in the ranks of the working class. Finally, and most important of all, there exists this time a powerful working class state, the greatest force for peace in the world, the land which, under the leadership of the Party of Lenin and Stalin, has shown the toilers of the whole world the way to end imperialist rule and capitalist slavery.

All of the above-stated factors point in one direction and one only. If the war continues for some time, and that seems certain at the moment, the working class and all the toiling masses will have something to say about the final peace and in a score of countries will take their fate into their own hands. Can there be any doubt therefore that the bourgeoisie, in order to maintain its rule, will act as have all previous dying classes, that it will resort to every means at its command to hold back the revolutionary tidal wave?

Only one conclusion can be drawn from the foregoing: An Allied imperialist victory is no "lesser evil." A victory for either imperialist camp would constitute a defeat for the people. The only democratic way out of this war is to bring about an imperialist defeat and a people's victory! An imperialist victory by either side would result in tyrannical rule throughout the capitalist world, in hunger and slavery for the working class and the people, in national oppression and national chauvinism, in new and more horrible imperialist wars to come. The way out has been pointed by our great comrade and leader, Georgi Dimitroff:

"The imperialists of the warring countries have begun the war for a new partition of the earth, for world domination, dooming millions of people to destruction. The working class is called upon to put an end to the war after its own fashion, in its own interests, in the interests of the whole of laboring mankind and thereby to destroy once and for all the fundamental causes giving rise to imperialist wars." (The War and the Working Class of the Capitalist Countries, p. 23.)

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE STALINIST CONCEPT OF "NATION"

BY HARRY MARTEL

NATIONALIST hate and chauvinism are assiduously fostered by all the imperialist powers in a frantic endeavor to prevent the socialist revolution and to attain world domination. Small nations that wallow in the quagmire of capitalist contradictions are but the small change of huge imperialist war transactions. The cry of the Allied imperialists, who, with German and Italian imperialism, mutilated Austria, Czechoslovakia, Ethiopia, Albania, and the real Spain of the people, that "the independence of small nations must be preserved" reveals "the profound hypocrisy and inherent barbarism of bourgeois society." (Marx.)

Under imperialism, small nations within the orbit of monopoly capital can never be free and sovereign. Imperialist powers inevitably place them under bondage. Stalin, writing in 1920, said:

"So-called independence of a so-called independent Georgia, Armenia, Poland, Finland, etc., is only an illusion, and conceals the utter dependence of these apologies for states on one group of imperialist powers or another." (*Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, p. 79, International Publishers, New York.)

But with the development of the might of the Soviet Union, the freedom and sovereignty even of its bourgeois small neighbor states can become transformed from sham into something real. Thus the recent developments in the Baltic region and in Finland have given the Soviet Union's small neighbors a historically unique opportunity of freeing themselves forever from dependence upon British and American moneybags. Whether this opportunity will be fully realized depends upon the elimination within these countries of those "national" imperialist agents who at all times are ready to sacrifice national interests for denationalized gold. The pacts established between the Soviet Union and Lithuania, Latvia, Esthonia and Finland are powerful guarantees for their peaceful and free development.

Peace to the nations—this is the battle-cry of the Communist International and of the Communist Parties in all land. Peace to the nations—this is the principle of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the living prototype of the future amalgamation of nations into a morally and politically unified world federation.

Today when nations, large and

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

small, in the capitalist world are engaged in a mad slaughter at the behest of the ruling classes of the imperialist powers, it is more important than ever before that the working class study profoundly the theory of the emancipation of nations. For it is the working class, to whom is now given the historic role of defender and conserver of nations and peoples.

That theory of liberation was hammered out in the fire of revolutionary practice by Lenin and Stalin. Their work has shaken the foundations of decaying capitalism the world over and utterly destroyed it on one-sixth of the earth. Clearly it is impossible to deal exhaustively in one article with even a fraction of their epoch-making ideas on the national question. These notes will therefore be confined to some of the implications of Stalin's concise and profound answer to the question: What is a nation?

I

At the outset let this be noted: Stalin was the first Marxist to give to the world the scientific definition of a "nation." Basing himself upon the teachings of Marx and Engels, and collaborating with Lenin, whose teachings he further developed, Stalin applied with consummate mastery the dialectical-materialist method to the realities of the national question and thereby advanced the science of society, opening up for oppressed mankind new vistas of free and conscious development.

Stalin showed that a nation is a material, objective reality, with a life and movement of its own, but subordinate to and interconnected with the mode of production. It is a phenomenon which can be understood only in its relationship to the movement of classes. To lose sight of this real relationship means to deviate from science in the direction of bourgeois nationalism, open or concealed. The counter-revolutionary Bukharins, Pyatakovs, and Trotskys, opponents of Leninism, never understood the relation of the national-liberation struggle to the struggle for socialism. Unable to understand Marxism, these pretentious petty-bourgeois "theoreticians" regurgitated the view characterized by Marx as a "Proudhonized Stirnerism," according to which "nationality and nations themselves are outworn prejudices." Stalin tore to shreds the arguments of that abstract "internationalism" which denies the significance of national life and thus separates the national question from the class struggle. He showed that this kind of "internationalism" is a form of chauvinist ideology. On the other hand, Stalin criticized that view which overestimates the role of the nation and thus subordinates or ignores the class struggle. The fetishism of "the nation" is consciously used by the bourgeoisie to corral the masses into supporting its policies of profit and loot.

Bourgeois historians and sociologists reveal their bankruptcy of thought particularly in regard to the national question. Bound up with the interest of their own national bourgeoisie, they dare not and cannot transcend the narrow

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

horizons of the ideas of their ruling class. The phrases of "freedom for nations" that one finds for instance in the books of Bertrand Russell and H. G. Wells are coupled with fear of the revolutionary methods necessary for the achievement of such freedom.

It is not surprising that an element of cynicism pervades these authors' views on the nation. "Psychologically, it [a nation] is analogous to a school of porpoises, a flock of crows, or a herd of cattle," says Bertrand Russell. (*Freedom Versus Organization,* p. 348, New York, 1934.) Here is subtly expressed the aristocratic contempt for the people as a "mob." And Wells, who reveals a tendency to negate all nations in the interests of negating the struggle against British imperialism, declares:

". . . a nation is in effect any assembly, mixture, or confusion of people which is either afflicted by or wishes to be afflicted by a foreign office of its own, in order that it should behave collectively as if it alone constituted humanity." (*Outline of History,* p. 960, New York, 1921.)

Clearly, with such views one cannot be a fighter for the freedom of small nations and colonies from British imperialist rule.

It is only in the ranks of the proletariat that one can find the clear understanding of the national question and the readiness to fight in an effective revolutionary manner for the freedom of peoples. For here alone is found the courage of scientific thought and the willingness to face its implications for action.

II

A supreme achievement of proletarian science is Stalin's creative definition of a nation:

"A nation is a historically evolved, stable community of language, territory, economic life, and psychological make-up manifested in a community of culture." (*Marxism and the National and Colonial Question,* p. 8.)

A nation is the result of a historical process. It is not a biological phenomenon, as fascist and reactionary racialists declare in an attempt to justify imperialist subjugation of nations and colonies. A nation is a product of social development.

Stalin's definition contains *all* the *essential* characteristics that *collectively* constitute a nation. Peoples, nationalities exist who possess one or more of these characteristics, but not all. These groups may be in the process of acquiring all the features of nationhood, or they may have ceased to be nations through the loss of one of the elements of nationhood.

"It must be emphasized that none of the above characteristics is by itself sufficient to define a nation," says Stalin. "On the other hand, it is sufficient for a single one of these characteristics to be absent and the nation ceases to be a nation." (*Ibid.,* p. 8.)

Stalin achieved the mastery of science in a struggle against a host of ideological obscurantists. His definition of the nation, the theoretical basis for the solution of the national question in the U.S.S.R., was crystallized in a struggle against the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Georgian nationalist Mensheviks, the Jewish Bundists, and the Austro-Marxists. Stalin showed that their views meant the ideological and organizational subjection of the oppressed to their oppressors.

How revolutionary-scientific Stalin's definition is may be seen by comparing it with a few typical bourgeois and social-democratic formulations.

Ernest Renan, the celebrated French author, delivered an address at the Sorbonne, March 11, 1882, entitled, "What Is a Nation?" His answer made the rounds in the intellectual circles of Europe as well as America:

"A nation is a spiritual principle produced by the profound complexities of history; it is a spiritual family, *not a group determined by the configuration of the soil.*" ("Nation," in *Cyclopedia of Political Science*, New York, 1904. Italics mine—*H.M.*)

Bourgeoisie and proletariat are one spiritual family, according to Renan. It is interesting to see what was made of this super-class, spiritualistic definition by R. Springer, the Austrian Social-Democrat, whose desire to maintain the integrity of the old Austro-Hungarian empire was exposed by Stalin in 1912. According to Springer: "A nation is a union of similarly thinking and similarly speaking persons. [It is] a cultural community of modern people *no longer tied to the soil.*" (Cited in *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question*, p. 9.)

Renan, the bourgeois idealist does not deny the material elements which in his article he seems to identify with geography. He "merely" relegates all of them to a subordinate place as compared with the spirit. Springer, the "Marxist," goes one step beyond Renan. He eliminates territory altogether and leaves his "nation" hanging in empty space. These definitions are a refined form of bourgeois politics. The political purpose of Springer's idealist definition is no secret even in non-Communist circles today, twenty-seven years after Stalin first told the world about it. Thus Max Hildebert Boehm, a student of the national question, comes to Stalin's conclusion that the work of Springer and his fellow-Austro-Marxians was "an attempt to counteract the tendency toward the break-up of the Austro-Hungarian Empire." ("National Minorities," in *Encyclopedia of Social Sciences.*)

Stalin's definition of the nation punctures the bourgeois, idealist view of the nation as a meeting place of congenial spirits. It is a scientific rebuff to those who base their theory of nation on "blood and soil," as do the fascists and Social-Democrats of the type of Hermann Heller. (*Sozialismus und Nation*, 1931.)

Stalin's definition enables us to see at a glance how false is the theory of the American sociologist Frank Hamilton Hankins, which makes the presence of statehood the supreme criterion of a nation. Hankins declares:

"A nation, like a tribe, is also marked by a high degree of unity of language, religion, and social tradition, *and always by self-govern-*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment." (*Introduction to the Study of Society*, p. 99, New York, 1929. Italics mine—*H.M.*)

One might ask Hankins: What of the nations of India, of Indonesia, or what of the Czech nation? None of them has self-government. Therefore they cannot be nations, according to the reasoning of our sociologist. What a convenient doctrine for all imperialists. It costs them nothing to give the right of self-determination to nations that do not need the right since they have self-government. And, having been pupils of Hankins, they can say that they need not grant the right of self-determination to the peoples of Africa and Asia, since there are no nations there. That is proved by the fact that they have no self-government, Q.E.D.!

A nation is not an eternal metaphysical thing-in-itself. "It goes without saying," says Stalin, "that a nation, like every other historical phenomenon, is subject to the law of change, has its history, its beginning and end."

The study of the rise of Western nations reveals their origin in the process of the bourgeois revolution.

"A nation is not merely a historical category but a historical category belonging to a definite epoch, the epoch of rising capitalism. The process of elimination of feudalism and development of capitalism was at the same time a process of amalgamation of peoples into nations." (*Cited place*, p. 13.)

The question of the rise of nations is, as Stalin shows in his works, world-embracing. In the epoch of imperialism, national life is coming into existence in the colonial countries where the people are struggling against their imperialist overlords. How actual are the following words uttered by Stalin in 1925:

"India is spoken of as a single whole. Yet there can be hardly any doubt that in the case of a revolutionary upheaval in India many hitherto unknown nationalities, each with its own language and its own distinctive culture, will emerge on the scene." (*Ibid.*, p. 211.)

The experience of the Soviet Union has proved that nations arise and flourish in the epoch of socialism as never before in history. The overthrow of the capitalist regime throughout the world by the proletariat in alliance with all the oppressed of these countries will bring to light hundreds of submerged peoples who, through the economic and cultural aid given them by the working class state, will be enabled to develop from backward conditions of life to a national existence.

III

Stalin's definition holds good for the entire historical epoch which marks the first rise of modern nations and continues until all nations are eventually fused into a world community of language, economic life, and culture. Reflecting accurately the objective reality of nations in their essence, Stalin's definition is the basis for the solution of the national question throughout the world. The elements of this definition are not metaphysical, static. They are interconnected and react one on the other. The psychological

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

make-up of a people, for instance, is not permanent. It undergoes a process of modification and change. Shaped primarily by the economic conditions of life, it reacts in turn upon these conditions. All the elements of a nation interact in varying degrees. That is why Stalin reminds us that—

". . . there is in fact no *single* distinguishing characteristic of a nation. There is only a sum total of characteristics, of which, when nations are compared, one characteristic (national character), or another (language), or a third (territory, economic conditions), stands out in sharper relief." (*Ibid.*, p. 11.)

Otto Bauer, ignorant of dialectics, singled out "national character" as the essential element of the nation, divorcing it from the soil. The nation thereby was converted by him into "an invisible, self-contained force." (Stalin.)

IV

In his "Dialectical and Historical Materialism," * Stalin concisely explains the subordinate, though important, role of geography in the life of society which includes the life of nations. But he shows that geography is not the chief, determining force. It is the mode of production that determines the life of society. The succession of social-economic formations, such as feudalism, capitalism, socialism on the same territory is convincing proof that geography is not the determining force.

The development of capitalist production marks the first great turn in the relationship of man to nature. The existence of the modern capitalist nation involves the development of means of production, the vast extension of means of communication, the building of cities, etc., a radical change in the aspect of the territory. The socialist epoch marks the second and more decisive change in the relationship of man to nature.

Under socialism the territory of every nation can become a rich homeland. The day is gone when the poverty of a people can be attributed to the nature of their territory. Poverty of territory today is due only to class oppression and to the stifling of agrarian productive forces or their unscientific, brutal use. Marx, commenting on the tendency of capitalist production, said that it tends to destroy both the worker and the fertility of the earth. But in the epoch of socialism, nature is subjugated scientifically and molded in accordance with man's will. A striking illustration is the conquest of the Arctic wastes by Soviet men. In the last ten years an industrial city, Igarka, has grown up; wheat is sown; rich mineral deposits have been discovered; and hospitals, schools and educational centers have been built; the nationalities of the North who were dying out and degenerating have now taken on a new life and are developing themselves economically and culturally.* The conquest of the Arctic

* *History of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union*, Chapter IV.

* For an important account of the new life of the peoples of the Soviet North, see "The Renaissance of Nationalities in the U.S.S.R.," by M. Chekalin, *The Communist*, April, 1940.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

has only just begun. Truly, in the socialist society "Nature becomes an organ of [man's] activity." (Marx.) Before it was possible to introduce socialist productive forces in these territories it was necessary to eliminate naturalistic theories of history, a la Bukharin, according to which man, instead of changing nature, must adapt himself passively to it.

What historic vistas are opened, what inspiration to achievements are offered by these socialist victories to the retarded continents of Asia and Africa, and to all peoples hemmed in by the stifling production relations of capitalism!

Stalin emphasized the truth that nations do not and cannot exist without a territory common to a compact people. The reason for this is clear. Territory is the medium whereon the work of a people is accomplished, the bonds of economic life are fashioned, and the social intercourse, resulting in distinctive forms of culture, takes place. A people must have roots in order to be a nation.

The Soviet Union, basing itself on this Stalinist principle, has successfully developed the socialist economy and culture of its many component nations. To small nationalities, many of whom had been rendered landless by the tsar, the Soviet government granted territory. For instance, the Soviet government gave Biro-Bidjan to the Jews that desired "a Jewish-administered national unity." This territory has become the basis for the building of a Jewish nation. Modern socialist productive forces have converted virgin land into a territory humming with industry and the sound of tractors. For the first time in history, Yiddish has become the language of government. A culture Jewish in form and socialist in content is flourishing.

As regards the majority of the Jews in the U.S.S.R., they voluntarily and freely participate in the broad stream of socialist life, as a rule fusing with the peoples of the respective republics of the Union.

Delimitation of frontiers has caused innumerable bloody conflicts under capitalism. Under socialism, the basis for such conflicts is removed. Who was to determine the boundaries of those border regions which would not, after the revolution, choose to secede as they had the right to do? Said Stalin, in 1917:

"The geographical boundaries of these autonomous regions *shall be determined by the population itself* with due regard for the exigencies of economic life, social life, etc." (Report at Seventh All-Russian Party Conference. Italics mine—*H.M.*)

And the imperialists who built a Polish state, violently incorporating within it Ukrainian and White-Russian territory against the wishes of the population, have the insolence to speak of the freedom of small nations!

In the imperialist world, in India, the East Indies, Africa, the Americas, teeming populations of peasants are ground down in agony on the territory of their fathers. The cruelest types of "civilized" savagery are employed by the imperialists and their semi-feudal landlord

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

agents to use up the last quiver of the peasants' endurance. The oppressors brutally ravish the farm lands of their fertility; the peasants see their families decimated by imperialism's specific contribution to the colonial and national peoples —hunger!

What Marx said about agriculture in the United States and other advanced countries applies with even greater force to the imperialist super-exploitation of peasant countries:

"All progress in capitalistic agriculture is a progress in the art, not only of robbing the laborer, but of robbing the soil; all progress in increasing the fertility of the soil for a given time is a progress towards ruining the lasting sources of that fertility." (*Capital*, Vol. I, p. 514. International Publishers, New York.)

Is it any wonder then that "the peasant question after all constitutes the basis and the intrinsic essence of the national question"? (Stalin, *Cited place*, p. 202.) And because it does, the national question becomes part of the question of the alliance of the proletariat and peasantry, part of the question of the proletarian revolution. The agrarian question reveals clearly the interconnection of the economic conditions of life and the territory.

V

Territory, however, is not enough to constitute a nation. Stalin tells us that there must also be "an internal economic bond" welding the different parts of the territory into a single whole. This bond is the result of historical development.

The bourgeois economic bond converts the nation into a framework of bourgeois action. Beyond the possibilities that a nation offers for exploitation and for being the tool of bourgeois action against other peoples, the bourgeoisie sees nothing. For it a nation without capitalists is not a nation.

Under capitalism, the national economy, based on antagonistic class relations, splits the nation into two. That was why Engels and Lenin frequently referred to the proletariat and bourgeoisie as "the two nations" within the nation. Under socialism, with the liquidation of antagonistic classes, the national economy unifies the nation, morally and politically.

VI

Stalin tells us that "community of language is one of the characteristic features of a nation." Again, it must be remembered that language is as historical as all other social phenomena, and its permutations and transformations are ever connected with the social process of production. Indeed, the origin of language, as Engels pointed out, is labor. Language is a creation of people engaged in work and is continuously modified by the class struggle. When Stalin, therefore, says that there must be a common language for every nation, he implies that the members of the productive population must understand one another in their economic and cultural life, and that their aspirations to unhampered existence must be voiced in an idiom which con-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tains the history of their social struggles, as all the colloquial languages of the people do.

How important language is in the life of a nation may be seen in the history of European states. Tsarist Russia pursued a policy of Russification by forcibly preventing the cultural development of the subject nations. One of the chief means toward this end was linguistic suppression. Similarly the Polish regime of colonels and landlords sought to eliminate or repress the languages of the White Russian, Western Ukrainian and Jewish peoples. Subtle forms of linguistic persecutions (fostered contempt and ridicule, for instance) are found throughout the capitalist world even in the absence of official oppression. The languages of oppressed nations are deemed by imperialists under certain conditions to be a subversive, revolutionary instrument.

"Community of language" does not imply "that different nations always and everywhere necessarily speak different languages, or that all who speak one language necessarily constitute one nation." (*Ibid.*, p. 6.) The Negroes in the Black Belt speak English, but the fact that that is the language of the rest of the American people does not prevent them from being a nation.

The implications of Stalin's statement for the future development of nations and their languages is tremendous. For example, the tendency toward the fusion of modern languages has been noted by students of language. This tendency arises from the increasing interrelationships of peoples as a result of the development of modern productive forces and means of communication. But what is now merely a tendency which is counteracted by class as well as national and colonial oppression will be given a powerful impetus when socialism is victorious on a world scale. It was the freeing by socialism of the international productive forces, and as a result the ever-closer collaboration of all peoples that Stalin had in mind at the Sixteenth Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in 1930, when he said:

"The blossoming of cultures national in form and socialist in content under a proletarian dictatorship in one country, *with the object of* their fusion into a single, common, socialist (both in form and content) culture, with a single, common language, when the proletariat is victorious throughout the world and socialism becomes an everyday matter—such is the dialectical nature of the Leninist presentation of the question of national culture." (*Ibid.*, p. 261.)

VII

The community of culture which, as Stalin postulated, is one of the characteristic features of a nation, does not imply that each nation has a hermetically sealed culture, or that national cultures under bourgeois rule are not shot through with class contradictions. Stalin distinctly states in his work, *Marxism and the National and Colonial Question* that such a view loses sight of the class struggle:

"In the early stages of capitalism one may still speak of a 'cultural community' between the proletariat

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the bourgeoisie. But as large-scale industry develops and the class struggle becomes more and more acute, this community begins to melt away. One cannot seriously speak of the 'cultural community' of a nation when the masters and the workers of a nation have ceased to understand each other. What 'common fate' can there be when the bourgeoisie thirsts for war, and when the proletariat declares 'war on war.'" (*Ibid.*, p. 32.)

What Stalin means by community of culture under capitalism is not its content which is bourgeois, but its form which is of necessity national.

The form of national culture is the result of a host of factors. Dissimilar conditions of existence (a higher or lower development of capitalism, for instance), the way in which the nation came into existence, the presence or absence of a mass of ideological traditions inherited from previous social-economic formations, the type of relations with other nations—all these factors mold the psychological make-up of a nation, giving it distinctive national forms. National culture, like national character, is ultimately determined by the changing social relations of production. "National character is not a thing that is fixed once and for all, but is modified by changes in the conditions of life." (Stalin, *Ibid.*, p. 8.) The opposite view that national character is permanent takes the nation out of the social world and puts it into the biological realm, as do white chauvinist and anti-Semitic race "theories." It was the understanding of the historical character of national culture that enabled the Soviet Union to solve, following the teachings of Stalin, the tremendous question of building up a new culture, socialist in content, and national in form. Stalin's definition of the nation, as a basic component of the Lenin-Stalin national policy, is the theoretical foundation for that mighty flourishing of national, completely democratic cultures under the dictatorship of the working class.

VIII

The analysis of Stalin's definition of a nation has shown that a nation is not the product of sentiment or idea; it is a material reality.

Under capitalism, a nation is a community of opposing classes, the class of capitalists oppressing the workers and all toiling people. Such a nation can never attain real unity. Under socialism real unity within and among nations is established for the first time in history, thereby ushering in a new era for mankind.

In his famous report on the Constitution of the U.S.S.R. in 1936, Stalin gave the answer to the question: How is the victorious building of a morally and politically unified multi-national state based on socialism to be explained?

"By the absence of exploiting classes, which are the principal organizers of strife between nations; the absence of exploitation, which cultivates mutual distrust and kindles nationalist passions; the fact that power is in the hands of the working class, which is an enemy of all enslavement and the true vehicle of the ideas of internationalism; the actual practice of mutual

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aid among the peoples in all spheres of economic and social life. . . ."

The most basic of these factors is the hegemony and power of the working class, the true representative of the nation. Once the bourgeoisie was the leader in the building of nations. Today, in the decaying stage of its system, the imperialist bourgeoisie are the destroyers of nations and of humanity. Criminally playing with the destiny of nations, they manufacture and destroy pawn states like Czechoslovakia. For their own vile purposes, they involve small nations, such as Finland and Norway, in their imperialist war-game, in their machinations against the Soviet Union, thereby madly attempting to solve their insoluble contradictions and antagonisms. In the midst of this colossal slaughter of peoples and nations, the working class holds aloft the banner of internationalism which expresses its constructive role as defender, leader and builder of nations. Now on an inter-continental scale, the working class organizes the struggle against imperialism. It inspires and leads the national liberation struggles, as in China and India. In the United States, the proletariat leads the struggle against reaction and the efforts to involve America in the imperialist war. And in Europe, the theater of the war, the working class is preparing to rid all the nations of their parasitic imperialists forever.

Stalin has shown to all who have eyes to see that the unity of a nation cannot be established by the governments of imperialists. These governments are based on the division of the nation into "two nations." Their function is the repression of the working class and with it the living forces of the nation itself. What a sham, therefore, is the vaporing of Roosevelt on "national unity"! What unity can there be between the Wall Street sharks and the ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed of our nation? What unity can there be between the handful "who thirst for war" and the masses who want peace and are determined to get it? Is not the Roosevelt-Wall Street "national unity" but the organized efforts of reaction to destroy the organized forces for peace and the national well-being and unity of our people?

The true strength and unity of the American people reside in the workers and farmers. By advancing today the formation of the anti-imperialist people's front, they are preparing to drive the money-changers and their political clerks out of the national temple. For it is they who, under the leadership of the Communist Party, will build on this continent a nation dedicated to the attainment of life, liberty, happiness, and peace. So teaches Stalin, the Emancipator of Nations.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE THIRD NATIONAL NEGRO CONGRESS

BY THEODORE R. BASSETT

ALL true fighters for Negro rights and genuine friends of Negro liberation cannot but greet enthusiastically the decisions of the Third National Negro Congress which gathered at Washington, on April 26-28.

The convention marked an enormous step forward in the centuries-old struggle of the Negro people. It was not yet, in the full sense of the word, a people's congress. It represented, in fact, the advanced detachment of the Negro movement. A firmer basis has, however, been established for the unity of the Negro masses. A new note, of far-reaching significance, was struck in the relationship of the Negro people to labor. The foundation for the historic alliance between the Negro people and the working class has been immensely strengthened.

The Congress convened at an historic moment, when crucial issues confront the 14,000,000 Negroes of the United States.

President Roosevelt, leader of the American war party, has already taken steps which involve the United States economically, politically and, to a certain degree, militarily on the side of the Allies, and threaten to draw us fully into that ghastly mass carnage. This Roosevelt hunger-and-war offensive has enormously aggravated the social and economic conditions of the doubly exploited Negro masses.

Hence the urgency of the struggle of the Negro people against unemployment and for jobs, for a housing and health program, against lynching, for the abolition of the poll tax and all the disfranchising restrictions, for the defense and enrichment of their cultural heritage, for Negro unity and alliance with labor and the peace forces.

Moreover, social upheavals are impending. The millions of the colonial world—yellow, black, and brown—are astir. Under the impact of the October Revolution the unity of the oppressed nations and colonial peoples with the international working class is advancing, a unity based on common fundamental opposition to imperialist oppression.

Main Factors of the Congress Movement

By 1936 the liberation movement of the Negro people had developed to the point where it was possible to bring into being a national organization of a new character. This organization was the National Negro Congress. The Negro working

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

class was growing in maturity and in consciousness of its power. Manifesting readiness to resist determinedly the oppression of the Negro people, it was coming forward to assume its natural place at the leadership of the Negro liberation movement. The Negro middle class and its organizations, too, were growing more favorable toward alliance with labor. There were also factors in the country at large which made this a propitious moment for unity among the Negroes: the rapid growth of progressivism in the official trade union movement, particularly in that part pledged to industrial unionism; and the developing united front against fascism and war.*

Today certain changes must be noted:

1. The top leadership of the Negro reformist organizations, which during the previous period was more and more adopting a policy favorable to labor and the class struggle, is steadily giving way, under pressure of the war drive of American imperialism, to an anti-labor policy.

The rapprochement between national reformism and Social-Democracy is an important factor in this change.

2. The powerful C.I.O. trade union movement, has become a vital factor in the life of the country, with its membership 4,000,000 strong, with more than 500,000 recently organized Negro workers and a corps of capable Negro trade union leaders. The C.I.O. has taken an advanced stand on the burning issues facing the American people today: peace, jobs, security, labor's independent political action. Its outstretched hand to the Negro people represents also the progressive rank and file in the A. F. of L.

3. There is a powerful sentiment to keep America out of the imperialist war, a sentiment, however, not yet crystallized organizationally.

Other factors shaping the Congress movement today are:

1. The outbreak of the imperialist war in Europe and the resulting aggressive role of American imperialism, the inner expression of which is the sharp Roosevelt war-and-hunger offensive, the brunt being felt by the Negro masses.

2. The upsurge among the Negro people reflected in their increasing militancy and developing struggles.

3. The rising national and colonial emancipatory movements throughout the world, the unconquerable spirit of the Ethiopians and the heroic resistance of the Chinese people; seething India, the ferment in Latin America and the Caribbeans.

4. The brilliant victories of the Stalinist national liberation and peace policies.

5. The widening influence and authority of the Communist Party, and particularly its Negro leadership, among the Negro people.

* See: "The Coming National Negro Congress." by James W. Ford and A. W. Berry, *The Communist*, February, 1936.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comparative Representation at the Congress Conventions

The Congress was representative of all the vital phases of Negro life. Delegates from twenty-eight states, fourteen Northern and fourteen Southern in addition to the District of Columbia, numbering 1,264* and representing thirteen types of organizations, assembled at the Third Congress. From two to three thousand persons attended each of the three general sessions. The composition of the delegates by organizations was: trade unions, 459; youth societies, 196; educational bodies, 77; church and religious groups, 71; fraternal organizations, 61; political parties and groups, 41; professional groups, 38; women's organizations, 33; unemployment organizations, 30; farm organizations, 24; business groups, eight; miscellaneous, 64.

Of the 1,264 delegates, 888 were Negro and 370 white;** 949 delegates were from the North and 315 from the Southern and border states. The largest state delegations were: New York, 571; Pennsylvania, 132; Illinois, 69; Connecticut, 48; and Massachusetts, 42. The District of Columbia sent 173. California was represented by three delegates. The Third Congress registered an increase of 115 delegates over the second held in 1938, and 447 over the first held in 1936.

The greatest growth in the relative number of delegates from different types of organizations is expressed in the steady increase of the delegations from trade unions and the sharp rise of farm delegates. The first Congress registered 83 trade union delegates; the second, 219; and the third, 459.

The first Congress had two farm delegates, the second one; while the third had 24.

Around 40 per cent of the Negro population lives on farms. Hence the significance of the sharp increase in farm delegates. That increase symbolizes the growing alliance between the Negro industrial workers and agricultural toilers.

Among the youth delegates were present representatives of the Southern Youth Negro Congress which had convened in New Orleans a week earlier.

The numerical proportion of Southern delegates, adult and youth, must be viewed in the light of concentrated work in that region for support of the Southern Negro Youth Congress.

A glance at the table below will give the comparative figures of the representation of the other types of organizations at the three conventions of the Congress.

Delegates From Other Organizations From First to Third Congress

Organization	*First*	*Second*	*Third*
Civic and Community	226	219	248
Fraternal	71	136	61
Political	46	107	41
Educational	14	95	77
Church	81	73	71
Women	23	39	33
Professional	6	29	38
Business	2	23	8
Newspaper Groups	5	0	0
Miscellaneous	0	28	64

* All figures are from the official published proceedings of the Congress.
** Six were unclassified.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Labor and the Negro People

Transcending the mere quantitative aspects of the increase in the trade union delegation is its social and political import. Its effect is twofold. On the one hand, the organic tie between the Negro movement and the working class has been strengthened, and on the other, the base for the Negro liberation movement has become more securely rooted. The Negro working class constitutes an indivisible part of the American working class. It is the natural bridge between the oppressed Negro nation and labor and other progressive social forces, the overwhelming majority of the dominant white nation. The Negro working class is the only consistently revolutionary class among the Negro people. The Negro working class alone is qualified by its socio-economic position to lead the Negro people through struggle to the exercise of the right of national self-determination.

This shift of forces on class lines in the inner life of the Congress movement is of paramount importance, no less to the peace, labor and socialist movement than to the Negro movement itself.

The invitation to the Congress to affiliate with Labor's Non-Partisan League extended by John L. Lewis, President of the C.I.O., and its acceptance by John P. Davis, National Secretary of the Congress, symbolizes the advance along the road of this historic alliance.

Lewis declared, in his speech at the opening session of the Congress:

"I, therefore, call upon you and the millions of Americans whom you represent to join in common cause with labor that we may seek out as American citizens together those political means and instruments by which the common welfare may be promoted.

"In this same hall in February I extended an invitation to the American Youth Congress and the millions of young people affiliated with it to make common cause with Labor's Non-Partisan League for the promotion of a just and sensible program for public welfare. To the National Negro Congress and to your affiliates I would extend that same invitation to affiliate with or to reach a working agreement with Labor's Non-Partisan League that our common purposes may better be attained."

In his reply to Lewis the following day, John P. Davis, voicing a sentiment which received almost unanimous approval, declared:

"The Negro people are happy to accept the invitation of John L. Lewis to come to a working agreement with the mighty forces of labor and to go forward to victory; for victory can now be won. I have no doubt that the delegates to this great Congress will unanimously and enthusiastically accept the invitation of Mr. Lewis to arrive at a working agreement of the National Negro Congress with the forces of progressive labor, on the basis of the program of our Congress."

This great joining of forces was the high point of the Convention.

Not since the days of Reconstruction have there been such great possibilities for the advance toward Negro emancipation, now on a higher level and in a new setting. The unstable bourgeois ally of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Reconstruction period, long since turned counter-revolutionary and now decrepit, is striving with might and main to drag the people into the abyss of imperialist war. The working class, imperishable ally of the Negro people, then just beginning its great advance, but is now growing to full maturity.

The Constitution

A constitution was adopted defining the aims and objects of the Congress. On the structure and aims of the Congress the Constitution states:

"The Congress is a federated organization which seeks to unite the Negro people and all friends of Negro freedom for complete social justice and full citizenship for the Negro Americans. The Congress does not duplicate any organization. It is a federated body not only in its organizational structure but in its fundamental philosophy and policy. It is a common ground upon which all organizations interested in Negro rights and the promotion of democracy for all Americans in the country can meet and pool their strength and resources toward the common goal of social, economic and political betterment. It seeks through constructive and united action to achieve its objectives."

The organization states its objects to be:

"1. To secure the full rights of citizenship for the Negro people as guaranteed by the 13th, 14th and 15th Amendments to the Federal Constitution, through removal of the poll tax and all other forms of unconstitutional restrictions upon the right to vote.

"2. To secure the right of the Negro people to be free from Jim-Crowism, segregation, discrimination, lynching and mob violence, and to work for the enactment of Federal anti-lynching legislation.

"3. To secure employment for the Negro people free from all manner of job discrimination by governmental agencies and private industry.

"4. To promote the cause of trade unionism among Negroes and to work for the organization of Negro workers into trade unions on a basis of full equality with all other trade union members.

"5. To work for effective and adequate local, state and national programs for meeting the educational, health and housing needs of the people without discrimination with respect to geographical areas, and to provide for security against old age, unemployment and want.

"6. To foster the cultural development and expression of the Negro people, to spread the truth regarding their traditions and contributions to American democracy, and to combat all falsifications and distortions of their historic role in American life.

"7. To promote the cause of peace, to aid the liberation of the oppressed peoples of Africa, West Indies, China, India, and Latin America, whose aspirations for freedom are one with ours; to oppose imperialist wars and oppression and to strive for the realization of a genuine brotherhood of man in our time.

"8. To promote the spirit of unity and cooperation between the Negro and white people in a common struggle for their mutual welfare and advancement."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Report of the National Secretary

The dynamic young National Secretary, John P. Davis, in his report to the Congress, declared with reference to the vital questions of civil liberties and war:

"What do the Negro people want? Not war—but peace; not guns, but jobs; not death, but life; not reaction, but democratic rights. That is why there is an increasing ground swell in the ranks of labor saying, *'The Yanks Are Not Coming.'* That is why the youth of our nation are declaring: there is no future in Flanders Field. That is why the Negro people are saying: we shall not die in the war of American imperialism. We have a war of our own—against hunger, against lynching, against peonage, against Jim-Crowism, for the right to vote and the right to work. The enemy of American democracy is at home. Let us fight that enemy here. . . .

"We Negro people who suffer most from the economic maladies of depression and unemployment, who are deprived of the simplest democratic rights, who are subjected to indignity and oppression, are fully aware that involvement in this war is no solution to our problems. . . .

"One of the chief diversions being practiced by the makers of war, by American reactionaries, by reactionaries everywhere, is the attempt to create diversion by organizing and inciting a war against the Soviet Union.

"I have visited the Soviet Union. I have talked to the Soviet people. I have witnessed their accomplishments and achievements. I know of their ideals and aspirations. I have witnessed the real and genuine equal rights and freedom of its many minority peoples. I have witnessed their many nations and peoples busy and working in amity, collaboration and peace. I know of their deep friendship and aid to all oppressed peoples. And on the basis of that experience and knowledge, which is shared by thousands of people, I firmly believe that the American Negro people will refuse to fall victim to anti-Soviet adventures, will refuse to join American or world imperialism in any attack against the Soviet people. . . .

"Just as the Ku Klux Klan tars and feathers its victims, so the Dies Committee smears labor organizations, youth organizations, Negro organizations and other progressive organizations fighting for the welfare and democratic rights of the American people.

"But we can only fight against the reaction of Martin Dies by refusing to be trapped by the wave of red hysteria which Dies has created. . . .

"Let us stand for progress, for peace; for security, democracy; jobs, civil rights, American standards. And let *unity* be the instrument of achieving these."

These remarks of the National Secretary were consistent with the aims and objects of the National Negro Congress and with the fundamental interests of the Negro people.

Resolutions

The program of the Congress was implemented with strong resolutions.

A resolution on the imperialist war condemned the Roosevelt Administration for its pro-war measures; it also lashed out against Negro discrimination in the aircraft industry and in the army and navy.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Congress resolved on unity with Labor's Non-Partisan League, and demanded the immediate dissolution of the Dies Committee. The other resolutions dealt with the various issues facing the Negro people, the question of economic and social security, citizenship rights and cultural freedom. There were resolutions calling for the immediate release of the five remaining Scottsboro boys; condemning the Ku Klux Klan terror and the failure of the F.B.I. to investigate K.K.K. terrorism; calling for the passage of the Anti-Lynching Bill and the Geyer Poll Tax Bill; and demanding the abolition of peonage.

The resolutions brought before the general session were passed almost unanimously. The miserable little groups of Trotskyite-Lovestoneite-Thomasite disrupters were so isolated that they dared not raise their voices.

The Defection of Randolph

The speech of A. Phillip Randolph, president of the Congress, which followed that of John L. Lewis, bristled with the most vicious and provocative anti-working class, anti-Communist, anti-Soviet slanders.

The enthusiastic Congress tensely awaited the message of Randolph. But his speech filled the audience with uneasiness, consternation and disgust. His words were not the words of Negro labor, of the Negro people. They were the words of the frightened Negro petty bourgeoisie, chattering with fear, pleading for mercy before the white master. They were the words of treacherous Social-Democracy. Of the progressive Randolph of 1936 only a hollow mockery remains.

The Randolph of 1940 rejects the Randolph of 1936. While the Congress and its program remain, Randolph has changed. He counsels the Negro to reject the outstretched hand of labor. He bleats about the desirability of Negroes joining "hands in helping to build a national farmer-labor political party," but he rejects the practical offer of Lewis for independent political action which he belatedly discovers, after five years, to be destructive of the "mass character of the Congress." Randolph now merely swells the chorus of Rooseveltian and Wall Street warmongers. He slanders and incites war against the Soviet Union.

He is running Dies a close race in his slander of the Communist Party and the U.S.S.R. He rejects a united Negro movement. He calls upon the Negro people to be "loyal" to their imperialist oppressors.

Such scraping before the white ruling class and their spokesmen can only breed contempt and bring the heels of the Southern bourbons and their Northern brothers down more heavily upon the neck of the Negro people.

Randolph's desertion of the Negro people is typical of warmongering Social-Democracy. He also sounds a petty-bourgeois nationalist note, exclaiming: "The Negro must save himself, he must depend on his own right arm!" This is indicative of the increasing coalescence of Social-Democracy with national reformism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Red-Baiting Rejected

An outstanding contribution at the Congress was the speech of James W. Ford, who had just returned from a six-month stay in Mexico. He made an exposure of a shocking plot on the part of Martin Dies against the Mexican government and people. He brought greetings of solidarity from the Mexican people and the great inter-American Indian Congress. He was received with enthusiastic applause. Red-baiting was decisively rejected by the delegates.

John P. Davis and other Congress leaders, who not only refused to be stampeded but on the contrary took the offensive against manifestation of red-baiting, Roosevelt warmongering, and anti-Soviet incitations, thereby rendered valuable service to the Negro people.

At the final session, Randolph, faced by the overwhelming sentiment of the Congress against his position on the most vital issues confronting the Negro people today, tendered his resignation as President.

Dr. Max Yergan, Director of the International Committee on African Affairs and heretofore Vice-president of the Congress, was unanimously elected President.

The outlook for the Congress with Dr. Yergan at the helm is indeed bright. He is a man of sterling qualities, unselfish and indefatigable. He is staunch in his championship of Negro rights and unbounded in his devotion to human freedom.

The Negro People and Civil Rights of Communists

It is an indisputable fact, corroborated by our present experiences, that attacks on the Communists give rise to sharper repression against the Negro masses.

The white-robed Ku Kluxers are reviving their floggings, tortures, and murders, and are resorting to all sorts of repressions against the Negro masses who are beginning to assert their citizenship rights. These anti-Negro, anti-democratic terrorist gangs breed like weeds in the dank soil of intolerance created by the wanton disregard of the Bill of Rights as evidenced in the recent trials and other pro-war measures aimed at the suppression of the civil rights of the Communists. All these events are connected with the struggle for Negro liberation. Roosevelt and Wall Street want a war from which the Negroes have nothing to gain. The Communists are the most staunch fighters for peace. The struggle for the civil rights of the Communists is an organic part of the fight of the Negro masses and all toilers for civil liberties and peace.

The Negro Masses and the Soviet Peace Policy

Anglo-French imperialism with the support of the American bourgeoisie is striving to convert the present imperialist war into a war against the U.S.S.R.; a war against the liberation movements of all peoples. Imperialist war means indescribable misery, intensified exploitation, increased mob terror and death both to the Negro people here

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and to the hundred millions of the Negro masses languishing under the intolerable yoke of British and French imperialism. The world imperialist war of 1914-18 is a living demonstration of this irrefutable fact.

The campaign of slander spread among the Negro masses against the U.S.S.R. is for the specific purpose of dragging the Negro people into a war against 180,000,000 people who have flung their capitalist masters into the discard of history.

But the Negro people, who knew slavery, who now know brutal national oppression, who gave the world Gabriel, Vesey, Turner, Douglass, Tubman, L'Ouverture, will know how to resist such a war. The U.S.S.R. is organically connected with, is at the center of, all peace forces. It pursues a consistent policy of peace, of thwarting the spread of imperialist war, of limiting and restricting its scope, of hastening its end. This policy is in fullest accord with the fundamental interests of the Negro people.

No Negro leader can lead his people along the right path unless he takes into account in his practical day-to-day activity these incontrovertible facts.

It is beyond dispute that a few billionaires exploit ruthlessly the overwhelming majority of the peoples both in the home countries and in the colonies and semi-colonial regions, that the British and French imperialists exploit more than half a billion colonial slaves, a substantial portion of whom are Negroes. The British Empire constitutes a main pillar of the world imperialist structure of which all the chief capitalist countries constitute an integral part. The victorious October Revolution delivered an irrecoverable blow to imperialism as a world system. The freeing of the Western Ukrainians and Byelo-Russians by the U.S.S.R. from their bondage in landlord-capitalist Poland further crippled the world imperialist setup. The stronger the U.S.S.R., the weaker the grip of the imperialist oppressors on the Negro peoples.

Furthermore, the experiences of the U.S.S.R. show beyond dispute that the victorious working class, pursuing the Leninist-Stalinist policy of national liberation of the formerly oppressed nationalities of tsarist Russia, has solved every problem, in the main, which the Negro people face in the United States today.

The fear that the Negro people may learn from the rich experience of the formerly oppressed nationalities of the tsarist empire how better to fight for their liberation haunts the white imperialist oppressors and their bourgeois and petty-bourgeois apologists.

No Negro leader can lead his people along the right path unless he takes into account in his practical day-to-day activity the danger of falling prey to, of abetting, the attacks of the imperialists and their agents against labor, against the Communists, against the Soviet Union.

Unquestionably, the National Negro Congress only acted in accord with the fundamental interests of the Negro people in adopting the resolutions on imperialist war

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and on the dissolution of the Dies Committee.

Forces of Disunity

Conspicuous by their absence at the Third National Negro Congress were the top leadership of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and the National Urban League. A number of outstanding ministers boycotted the Congress.

Thus, Dr. Powell and Dr. Savory, of the *Amsterdam News*, organized a counter-movement to the Congress in a so-called "Congress" of clubs. It was their first manifestation of interest in the Congress movement. They are serving as the little errand boys of Roosevelt. No wonder they jump to the defense of Randolph of 1940 in their editorial of May 11.

All varieties of Social-Democracy, the *New Leader* crowd, the Thomasites, as well as the Lovestoneite-Trotskyite camp, carry on a persistent campaign against the unity of the Negro people.

The most vicious slanders were spread about the work of the Communist Party among the Negroes, instanced by the canard about the "demotion" of Comrade Ford and his "exile" to Mexico. Their slanderous rumors were timed as an attack upon the man who rendered splendid aid to the Communist Party of Mexico in exposing and cleaning out Trotskyite counter-revolutionary elements.

These outrageous slanders were passed off as "authentic" in the Social-Democratic *New Leader* and in a number of leading Negro papers. They insinuated themselves into the first session of the Congress through the speech of A. Phillip Randolph. The slanders were designed to create confusion among the progressives, to separate the Communists from the masses and thereby to weaken the mass movement.

Moreover, such calumny served to hinder the rallying of trade unionists to the support of the Congress. Only through relentless struggle against Social-Democratism can the Negro people's anti-imperialist, anti-war front be forged. The Communists must in the most concrete fashion arouse the Negro masses to the danger of Social-Democratism in all its manifestations.

Shortcomings of the Congress

Due to the disproportionate emphasis upon the international situation in a distorted fashion by A. Phillip Randolph, the living and concrete connections between the war-and-hunger policy of Roosevelt and the aggravated plight of the Negro masses were not brought forward with sufficient sharpness. Notwithstanding this, those delegates who represented the organized vanguard of the Negro masses expressed deep resentment and indignation at the war policies of Roosevelt.

The lack of working class unity was revealed in the noticeable absence of A. F. of L. delegates; this was due largely to the influence of the Social-Democratic and the reactionary A. F. of L. top leadership. Labor unity on a class struggle

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

basis is therefore a foremost concern of the Negro movement.

There was insufficient attendance and participation of community organizations in the panels, a factor which bespeaks weak connection between Negro labor and the Negro community. Negro labor must assert itself boldly in the Negro community. The tie between Negro labor and the Negro community must be strengthened. Considering its importance as a powerful weapon in rallying the masses, culture should have been given a central place on the program. Church participation failed to reflect the important role it plays in Negro life. Participation of both general business and consumer cooperatives was extremely weak. There was a pronounced ultra-Leftist attitude toward business. These deficiencies in the work among business, church, and cultural groups must be overcome for the Congress to expand in influence and power. Labor, as the leader of the people, is concerned in the broadest sense in rallying *all* strata of the Negro masses in the struggle.

The problems of Negro education as well as Negro achievements merit special attention today. The problem of the Negro domestic worker is one which must receive concerted attention. Attention to these factors particularly by the local, state and regional organizations of the Congress will help overcome these shortcomings.

South of the Rio Grande, in Latin America and the Caribbeans, reside 25,000,000 Negroes. Anti-imperialist movements are developing there. Contact with them must be established, maintained and strengthened. This, as well as the kindred question of foreign-born Negroes in the United States, received scant attention.

Tasks Ahead

The National Negro Congress, in serving as the unifying force of the Negro people and their organizations around an anti-imperialist, anti-war program of struggle jointly with the working class as a whole and all peace forces, is fulfilling a foremost need of the Negro liberation movement, of the struggle of the American masses for civil rights, peace, and socialism. Hence, Communists must give serious attention to assisting the Negro masses to build the Congress movement. Of especial importance is the building, maintenance and consolidation of the local councils. The role of labor as the axis around which alone the councils can be stabilized cannot be overemphasized today. Hence, Communists in trade unions have a task no less important than neighborhood Party organizations.

The program of the National Negro Congress is not Communist, but the Communists support the Congress wholeheartedly. The Communist program extends beyond that of the Congress; it includes the right of self-determination for the Black Belt. It is because the Communists know how to connect the day-to-day issues facing the Negro people with the basic principle of the right to self-determination for the Black Belt that they are the most consistent and untir-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing fighters for building the mass organizations of the Negro people.

Hence, we must be among the most active forces in building the National Negro Congress. Negro Communists must today participate fully in the life of the organizations of the people. They must help forge unity from below. Only in this way can they give effective aid to the Negro people in their efforts for true emancipation.

The October 13 Resolution of the Political Committee of the Party is fully applicable here. It declared:

"We must help fortify, safeguard and build the basic mass organizations of labor, of the toiling farmers, the progressive youth, the Negro people and all toilers." ("America and the International Situation," *The Communist*, November, 1939, p. 1000.)

Let the bourgeoisie and its defenders rave. It is the people who decide!

Reverend Owen H. Whitfield, Vice President of the United Cannery, Agricultural, Packing and Allied Workers of America, in his address to the Congress, spoke of the Southern sharecroppers, declaring:

"If they do take a notion to join the Communist Party, Martin Dies and his bunch of political thugs can go jump in the lake. I know as a Baptist minister I can throw a man out of the Baptist Church but I can't stop him from being a Baptist."

The people speak! The people are ready!

The Communist Party, through its pioneer work in the struggle for Negro rights, played no mean role in laying the groundwork for the broad Negro movement. Today, greater tasks face the Party. Let us tackle them in a Stalinist way.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

AMERICAN POLICY IN THE FAR EAST AND THE ROOSEVELT REGIME

BY B. T. LO

JAPANESE aggression and China's heroic resistance to it have made the American people Far East and China-conscious. The American people have practically unanimously condemned the Japanese aggressors and unmistakably demonstrated readiness to extend effective help to China's fight for independence. They have heard a great deal of talk by spokesmen of the Roosevelt Administration about the Washington Nine-Power Treaty and its provisions for maintaining the "Open Door" in China and guaranteeing China's "territorial and administrative integrity." At the same time, they have seen the Administration consistently refusing to take effective measures "short of war" that are within the power of the United States materially to aid China and curb Japan.

Especially since the outbreak of the war in Europe, there have been glaring indications of positive attempts on the part of the Roosevelt regime to conciliate Japan at the expense of China. To understand the reasons underlying these developments let us review past events in relation to the true meaning of America's fundamental policy in the Far East.

The "Open Door" Policy

The American policy in the Far East has been graced with the designation of the "Open Door," which carries with it the assumption of "upholding China's integrity."

But the "Open Door" is fundamentally an imperialist policy, taking this form for the United States because of its relatively late arrival upon the Far Eastern scene. By the "Open Door" is meant: (a) that China must not shut its gates to the imperialists; (b) that American imperialism shall not be denied by rival imperialist powers "equal opportunity" to plunder China. To American imperialism China's "independence" is acceptable only if it can be subjected to the "Open Door" for unlimited penetration by the United States.

It is significant that this policy was formulated by Secretary of State John Hay at the turn of the century, when American imperialism was expanding into Cuba,

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Puerto Rico, and the Philippines, and was suppressing by arms the struggle of these peoples for independence.

It is revealing to note the stand on Filipino-American relations during that period taken by Dr. Sun Yat-sen, universally revered as the Father of the Chinese nationalist and republican movement. A shipment of arms and munitions had been purchased under Dr. Sun's direction for a scheduled Chinese uprising against the Manchus. The plan failed and there was no hope for the supply to reach its destination in time. Dr. Sun then diverted the shipment to the Philippine revolutionaries who were fighting against American occupation after the Spanish War, his contention being that the Filipinos were fighting for national liberation just like the Chinese. This was a practical demonstration of his view that there must be international cooperation among oppressed nations in their struggle for freedom.

Against this background the true face of American policy in China can be easily seen. The United States emerged rather late on the field of imperialist expansion. By the time American imperialism began to cast covetous eyes upon China, European and Asiatic powers had wrested economic, political and territorial privileges from the corrupt Manchu rulers and had gained military bases in that country.

The "Open Door" policy in relation to China's independence has been characterized most clearly by V. Motylev, Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of the Institute of Pacific Relations:

". . . The policy of the Open Door aims at preventing the other powers from using methods of a non-economic character for expansion in China, because then the United States, as the best developed economically of the imperialist powers can be the most successful in the struggle for supremacy in China.

"The policy of the Open Door considers China not as an equal power but as an object of exploitation by all the powers. The United States has supported the independence and integrity of China only because it hoped in this way to turn a politically independent China into a China which would be economically dependent upon the United States (and in this way make China completely dependent upon the United States politically). The United States is not in the least interested in making China a strong country able to pursue a really independent policy. . . . Thus the United States is not willing to give China sufficient support to enable her to achieve a complete victory over her enemies and the full national and social emancipation of the Chinese people." (*Amerasia*, March, 1940, Section 1, p. 21.)

American Imperialism Intervenes on the Side of Counter-Revolution

The basis of real independence for China may be broadly defined under Sun Yat-sen's Three People's Principles: National Emancipation, Democratic Government, and People's Welfare. These principles represent in essence the earnest aspirations of all enlightened patriots in China. The first united front between the Chinese Communists and Nationalists (Kuomintang) was formed on the basis of this program, resulting in the great national

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and social emancipation movement of 1925-27. At the height of this national liberation struggle American imperialism, jointly with British imperialism, intervened, thus clearly proving that it is opposed to China's independence, that its "Open Door" policy is directed against China as well as against rival imperialist powers. American and British gun-boats bombarded Nanking when the Chinese Nationalist Revolutionary armies were entering that city. This was a signal to the national bourgeoisie to desert the united revolution and to unleash an unprecedented counter-revolutionary terror against the workers and peasants.

Backed and spurred on by international imperialism, in which the United States played an outstanding role, the counter-revolution was able to assume power in China and maintain supremacy, carrying on the most devastating civil war for ten years. The onslaught was carried on with special ferocity against the Communists, who obstinately held fast to the original platform of national and social emancipation. Literally millions of workers, farmers, women and youth, fighters in the struggles of the great united revolution, were annihilated. The national economy deteriorated greatly. At the same time, American trade with China increased. Until the Japanese invasion of 1937, the United States held the lead in both exports and imports, while its investments also expanded. Its political influence over the Central Government also tended to become predominant.

Japanese imperialism had watched the upsurge of the united national liberation movement of 1925-27 with caution and fear. But, encouraged by the counter-revolution, Japan intervened in 1928 with armed forces in the province of Shantung. As the anti-Communist war developed in earnest, internecine armed conflicts broke out between the regional cliques of the ruling regime. These were chiefly instigated by imperialist rivals. Japan was emboldened by this extremely chaotic situation and began its systematic subjugation of China by first invading Manchuria in September, 1931. Japan's aggression aimed at complete domination over China—a "New Order" in the Far East. It was intended to check and thwart the economic and political ascendency of the United States on the Asiatic mainland, as well as being directed against the Soviet Union.

This attack upon the interests of American imperialism evoked a protest from Secretary of State Stimson in the name of China's integrity and the "Open Door" policy. He expected joint action from Great Britain, which was not forthcoming, because of England's interest in establishing an anti-Soviet base on the very borders of the Soviet Union and at the same time maintaining Japan as a counter-weight to expansion by the United States in the Far East.

China did not immediately offer the necessary resistance to the invader. China's defensive position was favorable. Unlike Ethiopia and Republican Spain, her population is enormous and her territory extensive. Unlike India in the last cen-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tury, she had achieved a certain degree of social and political development during the past few decades, particularly through the experiences of the 1911 and 1925 revolutions and, later, the years of Soviet power and Red Army organization in various sections of the country. She was thus in a position to wage a protracted war of attrition against the Japanese invaders and in the end achieve victory. But she lacked unity. This was the decisive factor which negated the advantages of all the other factors, so that for seven years she yielded to the enemy without much struggle. Then came the re-establishment of unity between the Chinese Communist and Kuomintang parties in 1937. A united armed struggle against invasion was launched. For three years now China has been carrying on a life-and-death struggle.

The Maneuvers of the Roosevelt Administration

During this critical period in the fight by the Chinese people for independence there was no lack of public expressions of sympathy for China and of condemnation of Japanese aggression on the part of official Washington. But the practical help extended to China—which had the twofold aim of apparently meeting the widespread demand among the American people for support of the Chinese liberation struggle and to weaken Japanese imperialism in a protracted war—was insignificant as compared with the flood of essential war supplies furnished to Japan.

This shameful complicity in the bloody onslaught on China aroused a tremendous popular demand for an embargo on war materials to Japan, which was shunted off and defeated by the maneuvers of the Roosevelt Administration. The "moral embargo" on aircraft was a great face-saver, but at best it could not be of considerable practical importance, in view of the overwhelming superiority of aircraft at the disposal of Japanese imperialism. How insignificant its practical effect was is evident from the fact that it resulted in only a 5 per cent decrease in the supply of this item to the total United States war supplies of the first eight months of 1939 as compared with the corresponding period in 1938, before the "moral embargo" went into effect (Bulletin No. 16, Nov. 1939, Table 3, The Chinese Council of Economic Research, Washington, D. C.) Meanwhile, during the eleven months in 1939, total American war supplies to Japan stood practically at the identical level as compared with the corresponding period in 1938, the decline amounting to a microscopic 0.003 per cent. (*Cf. Ibid.*, Bulletin No. 17, Jan. 31, 1940, Table 3.)

The issue of the embargo reached a climax in Congress in July last, when the Roosevelt Administration engaged in its first earnest attempt to secure revision of the Neutrality Act. There can be little doubt that Congress would have acted favorably on the proposal to embargo war materials to Japan had the Administration really backed it. But the Administration leaders only played with this issue to secure support for the repeal of the man-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

datory embargo feature in the Neutrality Act. With the repeal defeated, they successfully maneuvered to shelve the embargo on Japan.

The Administration sought to create the impression, especially with the announcement of the abrogation of the trade treaty with Japan on July 26, that it was merely a question of deferring the embargo action. But the hard facts belie this. The embargo measure was not permitted to come up in the Special Session of Congress in September. Promises were then made by Congressional leaders to hasten its passage after the expiration of the commercial treaty. But more than four months have passed since its expiration and nothing has happened. Meanwhile the proportionate share of war materials in total United States exports to Japan mounted from 57.8 per cent in 1937 and 67.4 per cent in 1938 to 69.8 per cent in 1939, computed on the basis of an eleven-month period, from January to November. (*Ibid.*, Bulletin No. 17, p. 2.) While the percentage of this country's share in the world's supply of war materials to Japan is not yet available for 1939, the figure, which was 54 per cent in 1937, increased to 56 per cent in 1938. (*Ibid.*, Appendix B.) Since the outbreak of the war in Europe the United States can claim the "honor" of a monopoly on such exports to Japan.

The sabotage of the popular demand for an embargo on Japan by the Roosevelt Administration is consistent with the basic Far Eastern policy of American imperialism. As Motylev points out, in the statement cited above, American imperialism does not want the Chinese people to win a complete victory in their struggle for independence. A united, strong independent China will repulse all imperialist encroachment, including the "Open Door" encroachment of American imperialism. A complete victory for the Chinese people would encourage and inspire the colonial peoples in Asia and elsewhere to challenge the imperialist oppressors. Nor does American imperialism want the collapse of the Japanese militarist-imperialist regime, which would usher in a revolutionary Japan, thus breaking another important link in the chain of world imperialism.

A dispatch by Arthur Krock in *The New York Times* of October 31, reporting the attitude of the "official American group" in Washington, throws a strong light on its policy in the Far East. According to that dispatch, Washington officialdom was said to be thinking along the following lines:

". . . A really united Russia and Germany might not quickly contrive to increase the anti-capitalist strength in all other countries after achieving a victorious peace. But they might be in a position to offer their alliance to China, and then the thousands of oceanic miles which isolate the United States would shrink indeed and the shadow of a giant combination would fall heavily on this country. For Russia has been steadily aiding the Chinese to resist Japanese aggression; it has given China the colossal credit of one hundred fifty million gold dollars, according to reliable reports which have reached diplomatic quarters in Washington."

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In regard to Japan, Mr. Krock reported that one of the visions:

". . . has conjured up the triumph of the anti-imperialists in Tokyo and the inclusion of Japan in the stunning total of power committed to world revolution. The speculation, it should be said, has no support in the State Department. There it is held that even a provedly sincere German-Soviet alliance is sufficient to move Japan towards the opposing group, and a German-Soviet-Chinese combination would impel Japan to join forces with the West."

Mr. Krock is not fully explicit in this dispatch. It is clear, however, that his reference here is not to the fascist Germany, but to a *socialist* Germany. The "vision" of a socialist U.S.S.R. and Germany plus an anti-imperialist, if not yet socialist, China and Japan is the nightmare of the imperialists, not in Washington alone. That the State Department would diplomatically pooh-pooh such "speculation" is to be expected. But that such "visions" are none the less an important factor in determining Washington's foreign policy in general and its Far-Eastern policy in particular is beyond doubt.

Summed up, Krock's dispatch is indicative of these facts: that the Roosevelt Government (1) fears and hates the Soviet Union; (2) resents the fact that German imperialism reneged on its assigned role as the ram against the Soviet Union, and fears the rise of a socialist Germany; (3) is averse to China's acceptance of Soviet aid; (4) fears a strong, independent and progressive China, which will neither tolerate imperialist domination, whether Japanese or American, nor be a willing tool for war provocation against the Soviet Union; (5) fears an anti-militarist, democratic Japan which would neither attack the Soviet Union nor police China in the interests of imperialism; and (6) seeks, to use Mr. Krock's phrase, to "impel [imperialist] Japan to join forces with the [imperialist] West" in order to keep the Chinese people "in their place" and to prepare for the holy war against the Soviet Union.

The Plot Against China's Integrity

American imperialism counts on the support of the more influential sections of China's upper classes which have not reconciled themselves to the role of the Communists in the national liberation front, and which are influenced by the fact that the policy of American imperialism, in comparison with that of its rival powers, was more favorable to the Chinese bourgeoisie. The vacillation of these sections of the Chinese bourgeoisie becomes more important as China's war of liberation develops.

The few months immediately following the opening of hostilities in Europe were indeed critical for China. Speaking before the Governors' session of the Fifteenth New England Conference on November 23, 1939, Assistant Secretary of State George S. Messersmith, after reiterating the United States Government's respect of the "objectives, the spirit and provisions" of the treaties resulting from the 1921 Washington Conference added:

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"This does not mean, however, that we are not disposed to discuss with *all the nations having interest in the Far East* reasonable proposals which may be advanced for sympathetic and intelligent consideration of the situation in that region of the world.

"We hold, however, that any *revision* which may take place must be achieved by due processes of international law, in accordance with treaty provisions, and with *due consideration for American rights and interests,* rather than by unilateral action on the part of any one power." (Emphasis mine—*B.T.L.*)

Here we see a high ranking official of the Government of the United States conceding the demand of the Japanese invaders for the "revision" of the status quo ante in the Far East. Such revision was demanded by the Japanese imperialists in order to secure "the New Order in Eastern Asia." While the Assistant Secretary of State demanded "due consideration for American rights and interests," there was no insistence in his speech upon China's integrity or independence. Why? Because "all the nations having interest in the Far East" which took part in the Washington Conference, with the exception of China herself, are none other than the principal imperialist powers of the world. They have always regarded China as an object of exploitation. Any "revision" engineered by these powers would not be in her interest.

A week later, following up American imperialism's conciliatory offer to Japan as expressed in Messersmith's speech, Walter Lippmann wrote in the *New York Herald Tribune*:

". . . They [the Japanese] will find this country very ready to meet them half way in a general effort to establish a genuine *new order in Asia.* Though some Americans would object, the majority would support a project of peace in China which, while restoring Chinese sovereignty in China proper, *would recognize the special position of Japan.* They would find, if they explore it, *a willingness here to induce the Chinese* to negotiate a settlement of this sort." (Emphasis mine—*B. T. L.*)

Here we have an outstanding spokesman of American imperialism proposing to limit China's sovereignty to "China proper," thus conceding Manchuria and Inner Mongolia to the Japanese invaders. Moreover, even in "China proper" Chinese sovereignty is to be limited by granting a "special position" to Japan. This much is offered in the opening bid to Japanese imperialism. Evidently even more might be conceded at the expense of the Chinese people if and when the negotiations reach the stage of meeting with the hard-bargaining Japanese imperialists around a conference table.

The "majority" of the American bourgeoisie, reunited on all fundamentals after the outbreak of the present European War, was emboldened to reveal its "willingness" to induce the Chinese "to negotiate a settlement" that would surpass the ingenuity of Chamberlain and Daladier in the Munich betrayal.

It may be recalled that it was about this time that China's Minister of Foreign Affairs issued a statement through the United Press inviting the Government of the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

United States to mediate the Sino-Japanese war. This happened when the present European war was scarcely a month old. It was in this same period that anti-Communist activities were rampant in China, spurred on by the red-baiting outbursts on the part of outstanding New Dealers in this country. Armed conflicts were even provoked between certain sections of the Chinese national army and its best units, the Eighth Route Army under Communist leadership. These were really critical days for China's fight for national freedom. The main danger was not from the open enemy, Japan, nor from the open traitors, such as the puppet Wang Ching-wei; it came from the pressure and "inducement" of ostensibly "friendly" powers and the capitulatory attempts of certain wavering, but influential elements within the national front.

China's Renewed Unity

The steadfastness of the main sections of the Chinese national front, especially the unyielding stand taken by the Communist Party, smashed these imperialist maneuvers and enabled the national liberation movement to survive the most critical moments during the early months of the present European war. The Chinese army has crushed the major offensives of the invaders during the last few months and brought the enemy to a standstill. In the "occupied" territories partisan activities have been ever on the increase. These battles behind the Japanese lines were perhaps decisive in making it impossible for Japan to give any effective guarantee to Wall Street imperialist interests in those territories. The people's determination to drive the invaders out of China has never been shaken. The people of China have fought and continue to fight against both open traitors and hidden capitulators.

The dreams of an anti-Soviet crusade on the Pacific front through a Munich settlement of the war in China coordinated with the mad efforts on the Mannerheim Line, and perhaps with simultaneous moves in the Balkans and the Near East, were shattered by the successful conclusion of peace in Finland. This has produced a sobering effect upon both the wavering elements in China and the American imperialists.

The failure of this criminal imperialist plot has sharpened the ever-present contradictions within the camp of international imperialism. American finance capital, represented by the Roosevelt Administration, has been forced to postpone its hope of conciliation with Japan. American naval construction is being intensified. Plans to race against Japan for Dutch colonies in Southeastern Asia and even for certain British possessions are now on.

The sharpening of the contradictions between British and American imperialism as a result of the sturdiness of China's unity and the Soviet-Finnish Pact is also a factor to be noted. Counting upon American aid in the European conflict, Great Britain is nevertheless loath to let the United States fix its own price by encroaching on the interests of John Bull or his protègés (the Netherlands, Por-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tugal) in the Pacific and Latin America. In the past England compromised the Chinese struggle against Japanese invasion in order to preserve Japan's power as a police force for imperialist colonies, as a weapon against the Soviet Union, and as a possible ally in Britain's struggle against her rival imperialist powers. By the Craigie-Arita "formula" of July, 1939, Great Britain virtually recognized Japan's conquest in China. This was the month in which the Roosevelt Government abrogated the Japanese-American commercial treaty, when American-Japanese relations were particularly strained. However, the British attitude had never been so brazen as in Ambassador Craigie's speech in Tokyo. In this speech the British envoy lauded Japan as an empire working towards the same end as Great Britain. There was widespread apprehension that this speech forecast British recognition of the puppet regime of Wang Ching-wei, which was inaugurated in Nanking a few days later. The denunciation of this puppet regime by the Government of the United States immediately upon its installation indicated the widening gap in the policies of British and American imperialism in the Far East. However, the Roosevelt Administration is set on continuing its efforts to come to terms with the Japanese imperialists, utilizing the traitorous and wavering elements of the Chinese ruling classes.

Danger of United States Involvement in Far Eastern War

The sharpening imperialist contradictions also mean that the way is being prepared to make the Far East a new theater of war for imperialist hegemony, which has nothing in common with the interests of the working class and colonial peoples. China will not be left out of consideration in any general staff plan of the imperialists as a possible battleground or operating base. Moreover, China herself will be the most important object of contention. Secondly, as in all the imperialist wars, there will be propaganda to justify each side as the savior of civilization, democracy, and the weaker nations. Thirdly, such a war in the Pacific would be basically an extension of the European war, of the struggle for the redivision of the world by the imperialist powers. It would be an imperialist conflict directly contradictory to the interests of the working class and all the common people and the oppressed nations.

All sincere opponents of predatory war should see through the basic meaning of American imperialist policy in the Far East and the role of the present Administration in carrying out this policy. In view of the importance of China in relation to the Far East, the Roosevelt regime will continue its attempts to capitalize the tremendous sympathy of the American people for China in the interests of its imperialist policy.

The interests of the American workers, farmers and common people demand the exposure of the pretenses of American imperialism as a friend of China.

American imperialism cannot explain away its criminal conduct in supplying Japan with the bulk of

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its imports of war material by pointing to the petty loans the United States has made to China. These loans were made in order to counteract the favorable effect on the Chinese people of the generous aid of the Soviet Union which has amounted to many times the value of the American credits. The last twenty million-dollar loan extended to China by the Government of the United States was especially used to offset and confuse the American people's mounting opposition to war loans to White-Guard Finland. Above all, the Roosevelt Government has not lent a single cent to China without making sure of exorbitant profits for Wall Street at war prices. Finally, in extending these loans the Administration also hoped to strengthen the position of the Chinese upper bourgeoisie, the most unreliable elements in China's National Front.

As to the seemingly unimportant part played by Wall Street's economic interests in China much can be said. It is true that they have been rather insignificant in figures. However, these figures alone do not suffice to measure the economic importance of China for American imperialism. In the first place, this importance is determined by the fact that China is the greatest potential market in the capitalist world. Secondly, even with the present volume of her trade with China, the United States had succeeded in gaining first place in her foreign trade, a position which it lost in 1938 only because of the invasion by Japan. Thirdly, the small amount of American investments in China does not correspond to the actual opportunities or to the plans of American imperialism. The instability of Chinese political conditions served as a deterrent to American investments, but American capitalists look upon China as a colossal potential field for capital investment.

By effectively exposing the demagogy of American imperialism we can win the American people to support an independent "China aid" movement. We must strive to combine and integrate the struggle for the support of the Chinese war for liberation with the struggle against American involvement in the imperialist war either in Europe or as it is being prepared in the Pacific region. Only through such integration can the people gain a comprehensive understanding of imperialism and be best prepared for an effective struggle in behalf of China and against the demagogy of the imperialists and their agents. The insufficient linking of the movement for an embargo on Japan and the lifting of the Spanish embargo in the past was to the detriment both of China and Republican Spain. We must not allow the bourgeoisie to confuse the people on the question of war and peace in the Far East and in Europe.

Such an integrated anti-war campaign can be effective only through practical activities. The movement must be sunk deep into the working class and especially its organized section. Remarkable achievements have been made in this direction in regard to the European situation. But regarding the Far Eastern situation very little headway has been made since last September. It is

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

high time that American Communists, first of all, should heed Comrade Browder's warning at the February meeting of the National Committee of the Communist Party:

". . . that we shall not allow the special issues of China to be submerged in the new situation. We should see that the work in aid of China is continued and strengthened. We should develop the traditions of that great surgeon, that great man, that great Communist, Dr. Norman Bethune, who, as our representative, gave his life to the Chinese people in their struggle for liberation." (*The People Against the War-Makers,* pp. 29-30.)

We should support the intensified demand for an embargo on Japan and for relief to China. Referring to the question of an embargo on Japan, Comrade Browder told the February meeting of the National Committee:

". . . We should clear up the slight confusion that seems to be rising in some circles with regard to the demand for an embargo of trade with Japan, because the Government of the United States is so obviously playing with this question for purposes of negotiating an agreement with Japan at the expense of China. Some people have drawn the conclusion that to continue to fight for the embargo might merely play into the hands of American imperialists in its maneuvers. That is a wrong conclusion. The best way to smash the maneuvers of American imperialism is to create such a mass demand for an embargo in this country that the Government cannot play around with this issue for purposes of negotiation." (*Ibid.*, p. 30.)

Likewise, we must not hesitate to demand more liberal loans to China as well as grants to her of our surplus commodities. These should be closely linked up with our fight against aiding the imperialist belligerents either by cash or credit. Special campaigns for the aid of the Eighth Route and the new 4th armies will contribute towards the strengthening of the most advanced and loyal sections of the Chinese National Front. It will also counteract the red hysteria in this country and its reverberations among the upper bourgeoisie of China.

Let us move energetically forward to mobilize the American people in support of the Chinese liberation struggle and against the war policy of American imperialism.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE FARM PROBLEM AND THE WORKING CLASS

BY ANNA ROCHESTER

FARMERS' problems cannot be separated from the general crisis of capitalism. They require special analysis and constructive immediate measures. But in analyzing the farm situation and developing a program, we cannot forget that these problems are bound up with the economic forces and the class conflicts of capitalism in the present period. When this fact and its implications are fully grasped, the way is open for showing the non-farm workers that their interests are deeply involved in the farm crisis. They will more genuinely regard the farmers as allies of the working class. And at the same time the demands for immediate farm relief can be better integrated with a long-range program looking toward a socialist America.

Chief Aspects of the Farm Problem

Important aspects of the farmers' problems are familiar to us all: their subjection to landlords and creditors, exploitation by monopoly traders and processors, prices too low to cover the farmers' costs, and expropriation and displacement of farmers from the land. These aspects are all tied in with the nature and development of the capitalist system and bring the farmers into open conflict with the forces of finance capital. But the underlying problem itself is rooted in the fact that farmers are small producers, selling their products in the capitalist market. Forces inherent in commodity production have been creating problems for American agriculture for more than a hundred years. These problems have become an important part of a major crisis since the general crisis of capitalism has closed the former avenues of escape from agriculture into non-farm occupations.

The twenty years since the World War boom have also seen a further sharpening of the contrast between the technically most advanced and the technically backward farm producers. They have seen a further development of monopoly forces both in business and in banking. Price problems have been intensified by the combined effect of three distinct trends: the lowering of average costs through technical advance; the narrowing of markets; and the closing in of a few great corporations to dominate the outlets for several major farm products.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Problems of debt and insecurity on the land have been intensified by the rising investment in equipment required for commercial production on the family farm. Among the medium-sized "family farms" this was a definite factor in increasing their mortgage debt and their dependence upon rented land. All this again ties in with the problem of low prices for farm products and the high monopoly prices for farm equipment. While debt and foreclosure and increasing tenancy pressed upon the medium-sized farm, they more and more brought the farmers face to face with great aggregations of capital. For insurance companies, city banks, and mortgage companies increasingly displaced local business men and other individual investors as the source of farm mortgage loans and the owners of land acquired by foreclosure.

All these forces were present *before* the broad economic crisis of the 1930's.

By 1928, insurance and mortgage companies, and commercial banks held 44 per cent of the total farm mortgage debt. Another 7 per cent was held by the joint stock land banks which were really privately owned and managed in spite of their special status under the Federal administration. Ten years later, the mortgage loans held by these financial agencies had dropped sharply, chiefly because they had taken over great numbers of farms through foreclosure. In 1934, for example, it was estimated that all creditor corporations and public lending agencies combined held nearly 30 per cent of the total value of farm land in the West-North-Central states. And, in the country as a whole, some 25 large concerns owned more than 1,000 farms apiece.

In the economic crisis average prices received by farmers declined 56 per cent (between 1928 and 1932) while the average prices paid by farmers declined only 31 per cent. The price index of farm machinery was held by the small group of manufacturers to a decline of only 8 per cent during those years. By 1938 they had brought this price index back to the pre-crisis level, and at least fourteen items among farm implements and machinery were costing the farmer in current dollars from 10 to 26 per cent more than he had paid in 1929. The New Deal measures have failed to restore the pre-crisis ratio between prices farmers receive and prices farmers pay, and even in the 1920's this ratio was more unfavorable to the farmers than it had been in the pre-World War years.

Classes Among Farmers

Having made these broad statements, which are extremely important in themselves, we must immediately distinguish among the different classes of American farmers. Most obvious is the distinction between the family farms and the large-scale completely capitalist concerns where all the work is done by hired labor.

Large capitalist "farms" have been developed in every specialized type of farming, but in most of the basic farm production they provide a very small part of the total output. They do hold a dominant posi-

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion in the most highly specialized areas for fruit, truck or cattle-grazing. Notably in California they have created very serious problems for their smaller competitors. And here the smaller competitors include many producers whose general set-up in investment, gross income, and employment of wage labor would in other regions rank them far above the average farm. In other types of farming and other regions the production by large-scale units has been secondary to production by family farms.

No less important in the general farm problem is the sharp contrast that has developed between the upper groups of family farms and the very small producers. Groups classified by scale of operation and type of equipment shade so gradually into one another that the marked differences are too often overlooked. The tractor farmer, for example, who is trying to use mechanized equipment on too small a farm may be less well off than his neighbor depending on an efficient battery of horse-drawn implements. Or a farm, employing a hired man, may do less well than another with two able-bodied workers in the family. These borderline individual differences tend to blur the broad underlying fact that, taken as a whole, the tractor farms have lower cost of production than the non-tractor farms. And the larger the scale of operation on family farms, the lower are the costs in relation to gross return.

The difference between a farm that produces a gross income of $5,000 a year and a farm that produces a gross income of $500 scarcely needs to be indicated. They naturally represent a different scale of living and a somewhat different relation to the market.

In cotton, Southern tobacco, sugar cane and rice, the very small tenant farms clustered in plantation units have continued to produce almost exclusively for the market, with negligible output for home use. As recently as 1934, sharecropper farms had 36 per cent of the crop land harvested in Mississippi, 30 per cent of the crop land harvested in Georgia, and over 20 per cent of the crop land harvested in the Carolinas, Alabama and Louisiana. And in 1935 there were still 716,000 sharecroppers in the South as a whole, representing 21 per cent of the total number of Southern farmers. Since then the number of sharecroppers has been further reduced as benefits under the A.A.A., the improvements in mechanized cultivation of cotton, and the continued low prices have led many plantation operators to drive croppers off the land and substitute tractor farming with a smaller number of wage workers.

Sharecroppers were never in any sense independent farmers. The real operating unit on cropper land has always been the plantation, a form of large-scale operation often combining this semi-feudal exploitation and some use of wage labor on the planter's "home" farm.

Other small farmers, outside of the plantation system, have played a very minor role in commercial farming. Some are trapped in inaccessible valleys, cut off from any general market. Those who try to compete in truck, fruit, grain, dairy

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or livestock production have long found it extremely difficult to meet standards of quality. And the many thousands who have less than certain minimums of acreage or numbers of animals could not possibly utilize modern equipment even if they could scrape together the means of acquiring it.

From several angles, the plight of these small farmers had been greatly worsened even before the broad economic crisis of the 1930's. Including sharecroppers, the small farmers were about half of the total number in 1930 and produced less than one-sixth of the total farm output. Small farmers other than sharecroppers used at home a very considerable part of what they produced. Even when the sharecroppers are included, these (roughly three million) small farmers produced only 11 per cent of the commercial output. Their gross incomes (under $1,000 in 1929, including produce used by the families themselves) did not give them adequate food from the home farms and left them with very little cash for rent or taxes, possible interest, farm supplies or equipment, and the necessaries of living that could not be produced on the farm. These income figures for 1929 are important, not only because they are the latest available data for the country as a whole but also because they show the seriousness of the small farmers' situation even before the 1930's.

Only one-fourth of these small farmers were sharecroppers, subject to this extreme exploitation by landlords. The others included every form of land tenure, with a very considerable group of unmortgaged owners. Problems of small farmers are made worse by tenancy, but they are not solved by independent ownership.

Markets and Productivity of Labor

Basic to the small farmers' situation is the great increase in productivity of labor on the land. Increasing productivity of farm labor is nothing new.

Certain familiar inventions like the Whitney cotton gin in 1793, the McCormick reaper in the 1830's, the threshing machine, the reaper and binder have marked the successive stages. The internal combustion engine opened the latest cycle of mechanical advance, bringing not only the heavy-duty tractor but the practical combine, the high-set tractor for cultivation of row-crops, the mechanical corn-picker, and innumerable items of specialized equipment. These have affected every type of farming. Even in cotton, where the mechanical picker is sitll considered experimental for conditions in the United States, mechanized equipment for planting and cultivating has greatly reduced the labor required.

The building up of a great body of scientific knowledge on soil chemistry, prevention of erosion, control of pests, the development of desirable strains in plants, and the breeding of animals best adapted to the purposes for which they are needed have all contributed to raise the productivity of labor in farming.

According to the National Resources Committee report on *Tech-*

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nological Trends and National Policy:

"In 1787, the year the Constitution was framed, the surplus food produced by 19 farmers went to feed one city person. In recent average years 19 people on farms have produced enough food for 56 non-farm people, plus ten living abroad."

During the twenty years from 1909 to 1929, productivity of labor on farms had increased by at least one-third. But this average increase was most unevenly distributed, since it was bound up with some increase in scale of operation. Farms with considerably more than average income produced a much higher percentage of the total farm output in 1929 than in 1899, while the competitive position of small farms was greatly worsened. This trend has continued through the crisis of the 1930's.

Markets have not kept pace with this increase in productivity. For products entering largely into export trade—cotton, pork products, wheat, tobacco—foreign outlets have been greatly narrowed by the British drive for self-sufficiency within the empire and for trade with countries closely tied to British interests. Crisis within Germany had closed that important market for American lard even before the outbreak of the second imperialist war. Japanese who had bought much American cotton have been seeking and developing cotton in Brazil and other regions nearer home. The sharpening of imperialist rivalries has directly affected the foreign markets for American farm products. The present war in Europe is not breaking down these barriers to exports from American farms.

Here at home, during the 1930's mass purchasing power was sharply reduced by unemployment and the "emergency" budgets allowed to those on relief.

On this question of markets, in relation to farmers' productivity—as on other aspects of their problem—the twenty years since the World War have merely accentuated earlier trends. For all through the nineteenth century and up to the World War boom, while total farm production was rising, non-farm activity was rising far more rapidly. Farm exports had been declining since the turn of the century, while exports of industrial products had continued to increase. And within this country, the fullest abundance of food and clothing and all the material equipment of modern living for an increasing population could be provided with a *relative* decline in the numbers working on the land.

Normal Trend in Farm Population

Throughout the decades of expanding capitalism, even when farm exports were still moving upward year by year, farm population increased far more slowly than non-farm. Until the general crisis, which crashed upon us with the World War as the opening act, sons and daughters of farmers had their choice of farm and non-farm occupations. And this exodus of farm youth continued in the 1920's. According to Secretary Wallace, "From one-fourth to one-half of the farm

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

youth left the farms for the cities each decade between 1870 and 1930."

Also, in the North (from Maine and New Jersey to the Dakotas and Kansas) the number of small-income farms declined by more than 300,000 between 1900 and 1930. They became a lower percentage of all farms in the region. In the West, the increase in small-income farms lagged behind the increase in larger farms. Even in the South—where up to 1930 more and more sharecroppers were employed—the large farms other than plantation units were a slightly higher percentage of all farms in 1930 than in 1900. White farmers who failed on the land could find some other way to make a living. Even the barriers excluding Negro workers from industry were somewhat lowered with the World War.

When industrial opportunities were open, farm youth and farmers themselves could leave the land with a sense of moving forward and not backward as they joined the ranks of wage-earners or white-collar workers in the city. This is the normal trend, as advancing technique has made it possible for fewer workers on the land to provide food for the steadily increasing population, and new scientific and industrial achievements provide the material basis for a richer and more developed existence for the entire population.

But now, in this long period of crisis, small farmers can find no promising outlet in other occupations. If they leave the land they join the masses of jobless workers. But these very years have seen great movements of population between land and city.

Uncounted thousands of small farmers have been driven off the land. These include sharecroppers replaced by tractor cultivation with a much smaller number of workers on a wage basis; other tenants whose land is wanted for the further extension of large farms; and destitute small owners, especially in the Dust Bowl but not only there. Some have given up "voluntarily," beaten down by the struggle on the land. More have been shoved off by landlords and creditors.

While these landless, destitute farmers have been thrown into the proletarian masses who can make a living only by selling their labor power and who now find fewer buyers for their one commodity, other destitute unemployed workers have been trekking back to the land. These were mostly men and women who had come from farms originally and reckoned they might better scratch some food from the soil than starve in the city. They went back, apparently, to "distressed" areas from which they had earlier fled, for it was chiefly there that farm population increased between 1930 and 1935. And it was chiefly quite small farms that accounted for the increase of half a million farms during those years.

Since 1935 the movement toward the land has been somewhat slowed down while more and more small farmers have been swept off the land. But the Bureau of Agricultural Economics estimates that farm population is still somewhat larger than it was ten years ago.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Objectives of Farmers and Workers

So long as capitalism was expanding, it was, in spite of its cruelties and exploitation, an historically progressive force. In uprooting the individual producers it brought them together as wage-earners in a socialized form of work which broadened and deepened the outlook of great masses and laid the social as well as the technical groundwork for advance to socialism.

One fundamental difficulty in approaching the farm problem arises from the fact that in agriculture this socialized method of production was retarded. And the inner contradictions of the capitalist system have plunged the world into a long period of profound crisis while basic agricultural production is carried on chiefly by individual producers, lacking the class experience of the wage workers. But farmers' problems cannot be solved apart from the solution of the workers' problems. And workers' problems cannot be solved unless the decisive mass of the farmers line up as allies of the working class.

Such an alliance can be achieved and can be made fruitful in the movement toward a socialist America. It must be based on issues and principles which deeply affect both workers and farmers.

First, and most obvious, is the struggle against the monopoly forces which stand between the farm producer and the city consumer and exploit them both. This involves government regulation of prices, and the struggle for limitation of profits and elimination of speculative traders. Even in its most liberal days, the New Deal evaded this issue. And where cooperatives supply a small group of processors they have been drawn away from farmers' control. The way is open for vigorous common action by farmers' organizations and labor unions. Demand for genuine regulation of processors and traders is always a live issue among the farmers. Workers concentrating on other issues tend to forget that these great monopolies not only cut down the farmers' income but reduce the purchasing power of the non-farm masses.

Working farmers have a strong sense of solidarity against landlords and creditors. Here they have felt the pinch of exploitation as small producers paying toll to finance capital. During the lowest years of the crisis, farmers raised the slogan, "Our wives and children hold first mortgage on this farm." Their vigorous resistance to foreclosure sales brought various measures of temporary relief. Now state moratorium laws have been expiring, and the Farm Credit Administration has returned to a fairly strict business policy. (That this will be modified by the recent transfer of the F.C.A. to the Department of Agriculture is by no means certain.) Interest rates have been lowered and a bill is under discussion in Congress for some writing down of the farmers' debts. But the smaller commercial producers are still unable to obtain credit without giving a lien on the farm, or the crop, or the livestock. The fundamental principle that the working farmer should have secure possession of the land he uses has

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not been conceded by the Government.

Workers have felt this same pinch of exploitation by landlords and creditors. If they attempt to buy their homes, they can do it only on mortgage, which means foreclosure and loss of possession when they lose their jobs. In the cities, or in company towns, they can find no shelter except in rented dwellings, and eviction follows as a matter of course if the rent is not paid. On this phase of security, farmers and workers have a strong common interest and a basis for joint organized action.

The so-called "social security" insurance system set up by federal-state laws excludes entirely those who are self-employed, and wage workers in agriculture and domestic service. Workers might well support a demand that the old-age pension provisions be opened to farmers (and others) who are self-employed. And farmers and workers are both suffering from the lack of health insurance and socialized medicine.

Of most immediate appeal is the fact that farmers and the working class are equally involved in the hideous situation which combines a market "surplus" of food and cotton with a serious deficiency in the volume consumed within the United States. "If the country as a whole were fully at work . . . consumer expenditures for food would be perhaps five billion to six billion dollars greater and probably half of this sum would be passed on to farmers." This is the sober estimate of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

At present American farms do not produce enough milk, fruits, vegetables, poultry and eggs and meats other than pork to supply the entire population with what the experts call a "liberal diet." Considerable numbers of the small farmers could be fairly started on a moderate scale of operation—not to increase the supply of cotton or wheat or pork but to supply these other deficiencies—*provided* the wheels of industry were also moving to meet the universally admitted needs of the population. With such an extension of the market, small farmers placed on well-equipped farms, with good soil, would be on the way to a partial solution of their problems.

Tied to this objective which can never be achieved without joint struggle by farmers and the working class is another task, perhaps even more basic in its broad implications. That is the orientation of all productive labor to provide for the masses throughout the country the abundance of material goods which America has the possibilities of producing. This challenges the capitalist system itself. But such a goal offers the only hope of normal activity to the rural youth who see nothing but idleness and blind alleys before them; to the small farmers who in the natural course of development would be shifting to other occupations; and to the more than ten million unemployed wage workers and youth in the cities.

None of these points raises directly the question of socialism. But all such efforts bring both farmers and workers face to face with the

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

powers of finance capital. The points could be won only through a struggle which would definitely weaken the hold of the capitalist class. They are fundamental to the welfare of wage workers and working farmers, and in the course of such common struggles each of these groups would arrive at a better understanding of the other's problems and of the system under which both are exploited.

The workers, tutored by the class struggle in industry, will have to take the lead. But at every stage of the struggle they need their allies of the countryside. For all the farmers, except the very largest producers who are tied in with the financial world, are vitally interested in weakening the power of finance capital. And in the struggle against the capitalist system there is no underlying clash of interest between the working class and the farm producer who employs no wage labor. When the time comes for transition to socialism and the nationalization of land, the working farmers employing no hired help—and these have now from 75 per cent to 80 per cent of all farms in the country—will be more secure in possession of their farms for use by themselves and their children than they have ever been before.

Certain Immediate Measures

It should be clear from the preceding argument that the attempt to raise prices through restriction of output is a completely wrong approach to the problem. The whole emphasis should be shifted toward increasing consumption. If every family in the country had good housing and adequate home furnishings much, if not all, of the cotton "surplus" would find its way to the market. With the sharp cuts in relief expenditures, we cannot state with assurance that all have even enough bread and other wheat foods. Wherever a genuine farm surplus is threatened beyond the needs of the population and not merely beyond the purchasing power of the masses, shifts in production might be desirable. But in all such planning two things, neglected hitherto, are vitally important. First, that the family farms, including the very small producers, and organizations of the unemployed workers shall have a preponderant representation on all county committees such as are now functioning under the Triple-A. And second that the largest farms shall be subject to regulation of output and limitation of profits.

Since the question of markets is so extremely important, it is also clear that ventures in cooperative production today offer a most precarious remedy for the small farmers' problems. Collective farming in a capitalist country, involving investment in land and subject to uncertain outlets and unpredictable price changes for the product, have no basis for success. Their failures under capitalism would be exploited to discredit the whole idea of collectivization under socialism.

Pending control over monopoly forces, and the achievement of security on the land, and increased production in industry to meet the needs of the population, the most immediate struggle today and tomorrow will be concerned with

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

adequate relief. Workers who read of the hundreds of millions of Federal money distributed in farm benefits tend to forget that the larger the farm the larger the benefits received. Even the $10,000 limit enforced since 1938 does not change the basic fact that the smaller the farmer the smaller the amount involved in his readjustment of crop and soil conservation. Benefits have borne an inverse relation to the farmer's need. They have aided chiefly the medium-sized and larger farms. Small farmers and farm youth have their own experience of stingy relief, withheld by county boards and state and federal governments because it is a function of these servants of the capitalist class to protect their masters from "too heavy" a tax load. The working class has a great opportunity to draw in the destitute rural population for joint struggle on this issue. And in the South, the battle against the poll tax could involve hundreds of thousands of small farmers—both colored and white—who are now disfranchised by the ruling class because of their poverty.

Small farmers see in almost every county the contrasts between their poverty and the comfort, or even wealth, of local nabobs. Most of them know very well that the great concentrations of wealth in the industrial centers are somehow interrelated with their own need. It is not only the Tom Joads, rapidly aroused to class-consciousness by the conditions of migrant workers, who will drop their individual aloofness and join wholeheartedly in the struggle against the capitalist system. But the issues must be clearly set before them as a common concern of farmers and the working class. And farmers will follow working class leadership only as it proves that it understands the farmers' problems and deserves their trust.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOK REVIEWS

FREEDOM OF THOUGHT IN THE OLD SOUTH, by Clement Eaton, Duke University Press, Durham, N. C., 1940, xix + 343 pp., $3.00.

IN THE view of most bourgeois historians objectivity means neutrality, and the scientific attitude is the non-committal one; and he who can see "two sides" to every question passes the requirements for accepted devotees of Clio.

Clement Eaton, in *Freedom of Thought in the Old South*, appears to lament the suppression of free thought among the white people (the Negro folk, though forming one-third of the Southern population, are considered only incidentally), the wholesale poverty and ignorance, and the existence of slavery. But his regret is marked by such restraint, such "understanding," and is expressed in language so hedging, so equivocal, so, at times, downright inept, that one is left with isolated facts, interesting illustrations, a well-designed cover, and the desire that someone would get hold of the author's important subject and do it justice.

Thus, on the one hand, slavery was an evil, but on the other, the explanation that it was necessary for the maintenance of white supremacy and the extraction of labor from "the indolent darkies" contained "much common sense and truth" (pp. 175, 319). At some points the suppression of democratic rights is due to the prejudices of the masses (pp. viii, 63, 82) who exercised great power (pp. 29-30), but at other points it is due to the people "with a large property interest at stake" (p. 88) who wielded great influence (p. 35) and effectively restrained the masses (p. 34).

The deliberate indifference of the masses to education is, on one page (69), as much a cause of the terrible prevalence of illiteracy "as the selfishness of the aristocracy"; but a little further on (pp. 70-71) the author uncovers a little of the poverty, disease, inadequacy of school facilities, and necessity for humiliating poverty oaths which result from this selfishness and explain this so-called "indifference."

Agitation, whether for or against slavery, is "pernicious"; the latter, since it is less "reasonable," being especially unfortunate. The author's heroes are those who publish a "liberal" paper "singularly free from anti-slavery articles," but against violence being offered to the Abolitionists, or those who, while conceding slavery to be an evil, yet feel it to be necessary, that the Negroes are contented, and that all reform must be very "slow and gradual." These people are "remarkably sane and well-balanced" (pp. 181, 243). These people, attempting to maintain an impossible

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

neutrality on a fundamental question not subject to weasel-words and fence-sitting, were, and are, willy-nilly, the allies of reaction.

Factual errors, some of which may here be noted, recur. Dr. Eaton accepts as valid the nonsense about Negro immunity from malaria (p. 23)—an idea that was nothing but one of the slavocrats' falsehoods to excuse slavery. The death rate from this disease among slaves was high, and if Dr. Eaton did not know this he should certainly have known that the present-day mortality rate from malaria is more than twice as high for the oppressed Negro people than for the whites. The reference to Drewry's travesty on Nat Turner's Revolt as "excellent" (p. 92) is laughable, and the statement that slaves outnumbered whites fifty to one in central Mississippi during the plot of 1835 is an enormous exaggeration (p. 96).

The author's declaration that the slaves were "remarkably peaceful and tractable during the Civil War" (p. 105) is utterly false. His dismissal of Dr. Woodson's estimate of the number of literate Negroes in the ante-bellum era is undocumented and is done in so glib a manner as to be impertinent to that outstanding Negro scholar (p. 120).

Above all, Dr. Eaton's minimization of class conflicts in the South and his repeated assertions that essential unity among all classes of whites existed (pp. 41, 63, 88, 247-250) are very serious failings. The present reviewer has brought together in *The Communist* (February and March, 1939) much of the evidence of the acute class struggles that threatened slavocratic rule, and considerable new material appeared a few months later in Roger Shugg's *Origins of Class Struggles in Louisiana*. The vital facts presented in those works and the sources therein mentioned are almost totally missing in Dr. Eaton's work, and this is, perhaps, its greatest single failing.

It is, however, to be remarked that the book does present considerable data garnered from out-of-the-way sources which give information on the processes and details of class rule and mass oppression —ranging from anti-Semitism to the dismissal of anti-slavery professors, from the destruction of "dangerous" newspapers to the formulation of a completely developed pro-slavery ideology. In doing this he has performed a service which will be found valuable to that historian of the slave South who will not confuse inanity with objectivity, nor the avoidance of calling a spade a spade with scientific procedure.

He who is willing to range himself on the side of freedom and against slavery will find, almost in spite of Dr. Eaton, useful ammunition in the author's work.

HERBERT BIEL

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NOW READY!

Why Farmers Are Poor: The Agricultural Crisis in the United States, by Anna Rochester . . **$2.50**

The scope of this fundamental study of the farm problem in the United States is indicated by some of the chapter headings: Agriculture as Part of Capitalist Economy; How Capitalism Develops Within Agriculture; Rent and Land Tenure; Farm Wage Workers; The Crisis of Small Farmers; The Farmers' Price Problem, etc.

Salute to Spring, by Meridel Le Sueur . . **$1.50**

A volume of short stories which have been highly praised by many critics. Some of the selections in this book include: "No Wine in His Cart," "Fable of a Man and Pigeons," "A Hungry Intellectual," "Biography of My Daughter," "Tonight Is Part of the Struggle."

Dialectics of Nature, by Frederick Engels . . **$2.50**

Translated into English for the first time by Clemens Dutt, with an introduction by J. B. S. Haldane, this invaluable work on dialectical materialism and the natural sciences has been eagerly awaited by American readers. Its publication in May constitutes an important contribution to the arsenal of Marxism-Leninism.

●

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

An Event of Major Political Importance!

THE SECOND IMPERIALIST WAR

By EARL BROWDER

320 pages **Price $2.00**

A new and basic volume of the writings, speeches, articles and reports made by the General Secretary of the Communist Party of the United States during the last year on the most vital issues before the people. With an introduction specially written for this volume and summarizing the lessons and conclusions flowing from the events of the past nine months, this collection takes on historic significance, providing an indispensable guide for leading and organizing the people's fight for peace and in defense of their security and civil rights.

In this volume, Earl Browder deals fundamentally with such vital issues and events as Chamberlain's sabotage of collective security; the meaning of the Soviet-German non-aggression pact; the war-mongering role of the Roosevelt Administration; the events in the Soviet-Finnish conflict; the peace role of the Soviet Union; Roosevelt's war-and-hunger budget; trade union unity and the role of labor in the struggle for peace; the meaning of the attacks on the Communist Party and its leaders, and many other questions deeply affecting the welfare of the American people. The volume also contains a basic analysis of the significance of the Soviet-Finnish Peace never published before.

THE MARXIST BOOK-OF-THE-MONTH SELECTION FOR JUNE

●

Order from

WORKERS LIBRARY PUBLISHERS

P. O. Box 148, Station D, New York, N. Y.

PRODUCED 2005 BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED